THEOLOGY

VOL. XLI SEPTEMBER, 1940 No. 243

EDITORIAL

WE were glad last month to welcome with enthusiasm two Reports of Church committees. Since then there has been published another Report,[1] which provides a dismal illustration both of a sinister species of clericalism and of the inability of the Church of England to set its house in order. The Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a committee to consider a proposal "to raise a subsidy for the augmentation of the stipends of the parochial clergy by a graduated levy on the income of benefices." The committee's Report is divided into three sections, entitled "The Principle Involved," "The Provision of More Adequate Benefice-Stipends," and "Action Suggested." It may be significant that, of the eleven members of the committee, all except one were ordained before 1912. The Report certainly exhibits a pre-1914 mentality.

* * * * *

The gross and irrational inequality of benefice-incomes is a scandal that has for a long time been calling for drastic correction. Several principles are involved—the clearest and most elementary being that the stipends paid to clergymen, as indeed to other persons, ought to be as justly and equitably as possible proportioned (*a*) to the responsibilities of the offices which they hold and (*b*) to their personal (*i.e.*, family and other) commitments. Our committee, however, does not mean anything of this kind by "The Principle Involved." Its primary concern is to insist that "any proposal for the redistribution of parochial endowments or for a levy on benefice-incomes should be initiated in the Convocation of the Province." This insistence is buttressed by the claim that in the case of "parochial endowments as of all ancient ecclesiastical trusts" the proper legislative authority is the Convocation of the Province concerned, and that Parliament has no right of any kind to interfere with the capital or income of any benefice. Then occurs this remarkable passage:

[1] As an appendix to *The Chronicle of Convocation, 1940, No. 2* (S.P.C.K., 3s.).

Up to the year 1664 the clergy were only liable to payment of the King's taxes by their voluntary consent. Since that date they have accepted individual liability for the payment of the same taxes as Parliament sanctioned for the laity, instead of assessing themselves in their Convocations.

This reminds one of Carlyle's observation about the lady who said that she "accepted the Universe": "Gad, she'd better!" The degree of euphemism embraced by the supposed "voluntary consent" of the clergy to royal taxation may be understood by recalling the reply of Edward I to the attempt of Boniface VIII in his bull *Clericis laicos* to exempt ecclesiastical property from taxation by the State. The English clergy were offered the alternatives of submission to royal taxation or outlaw. Moreover, it is a little late to contest the right of Parliament to interfere with the temporalities of the Church more than a century after the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission, by whose offices the revenues of bishoprics and cathedral chapters were drastically reduced to the benefit of parochial benefices. And, in point of fact, there has been a "continuous stream of parliamentary legislation with reference to the temporalities and civil rights of the Church."[1] If the laity may not initiate legislation with reference to the temporalities of the Church, what legislation may they initiate, please? The will of the clergy, as of any other professional class, is conditioned by its own interests; these need to be checked by the judgment of the laity. Nor can the laity reasonably be expected to make fresh contributions towards the augmentation of benefice-incomes if they are to be prohibited from legislating with regard to them. If the clergy cannot elect representatives who, instead of discussing romantic ecclesiastical archæology, will come to terms with the world in which we are living, we hope some non-sacerdotal body will take the matter in hand.

* * * * *

Under the heading "The Provision of More Adequate Benefice-Stipends," the committee points out that, even if all the stipends in the two English Provinces were pooled and equally divided, the stipend of each incumbent would not exceed £375 a year, whereas the committee considers that, "even on the present monetary standards, £500 a year is barely sufficient to enable clergymen to keep up the modest establishment expected of them and to educate their

[1] Blunt and Phillimore, *The Book of Church Law*[11] (1921), p. 24.

children." No doubt, under existing conditions (*immodest* parsonage houses, etc.), £375 a year is very often an insufficient stipend; but the committee fails to consider the possibility that the clergy need not *ex officio* continue to live according to the standards of the middle class, and also the inequity involved in paying a fixed stipend to an incumbent irrespective of whether he is unmarried or has a wife and many children. In order to raise all stipends to £500 a year, the committee estimates that £1,500,000 a year would be required, and that the net yield of a levy on benefice-incomes would not exceed £200,000. This would leave £1,300,000 a year to be raised from other, presumably lay, sources. As things are, this is crying for the moon.

* * * * *

The " Action Suggested " by the committee was that the Lower House of Convocation should " express its willingness to consider voting a subsidy to a Common Fund for the augmentation of clerical stipends, if and when such a Fund is established under regulations approved by the Convocation." This amounted to a recommendation to do nothing. We learn that the resolutions proposed by the committee were carried in the Lower House, as well they may have been, since they committed the House to no more than a desire to keep the initiative in its own hands, an initiative which obviously it is in no hurry whatever to take. Actually, the whole proceeding is hopelessly unrealistic. The committee desiderates a general augmentation of the value of benefices, when the real question is, How is the middle class (which the committee has in view) going to react to the impending heavy increase in taxation which will make the maintenance of its accustomed standards impossible? This is no time for passing procrastinating resolutions. In 1940 an equitable distribution of clerical stipends is urgent, not because there is any early prospect of raising their average value, but because the clergy should be offering an example of the way in which financial burdens may be fraternally shared and the Church's resources in men and money used so as best to serve its spiritual work.

* * * * *

NOTE.—Since the above was written, " Proposals for Reform," by the authors of *Men, Money and Ministry*, have been published in *The Guardian* (August 16). The spirit and substance of this unofficial statement compare extremely favourably with those of the Convocation Report.

Alfred Loisy (1857-1940)

Once more it is my lot to write an obituary article on an eminent Frenchman, who has passed away just as his country was about to succumb to the deepest humiliation that can be inflicted on a great and noble land; a land to which all Europe looked proudly as a chief light of the world. Neither Paul Desjardins[1] nor Alfred Loisy saw the worst, although the latter, who died June 1st, 1940, came very near to doing so. In September, 1939, he wrote to me: " Observe that this is my third war. With my own eyes I saw Napoleon III in 1870, going forward to be beaten; and soon afterwards we had an army in our village. But that was art in its childhood; an old general on horseback came to our house, and the following night came the order to march on Sedan."

(An " old general "; has France never any young ones ?)

On Easter Sunday, 1940, he wrote again, in what was, I think, his last letter to me:

" For some weeks I have been living in a whirlwind; my habits broken; my health so declining that I cannot even complete the classification of my papers. I need not add that I am writing nothing new. Perhaps, indeed, I have already written too much and would have done better to stop after the *Crise Morale du temps présent*;[2] I should have little to add to it. This morning I heard the king of Rumania declare that his government only consults the interests of his own country. But that is just what should not be."

And farther on he adds sadly:

" Never have I felt so deeply as now how little a weak man can do, whose only means of action is his pen."

To this I replied by reminding him that St Augustine's words and works live on, while all memory has perished of those who besieged the city where he lay dying. And I think that, of late, Alfred Loisy had been more engrossed in the effort to set before the world a higher and more spiritual ideal of political and national life than in his life-long critical work.

He was grievously troubled, as he told me in the letter of September, 1939, in regard to his papers, and what would be their fate should he die before the war was ended. I

[1] See *Hibbert Journal* (July). [2] 1937.

can only hope that some satisfactory solution was found; for on March 4, 1940, his devoted friend, Louis Canet, whom he had charged with the disposal of his affairs, wrote me that Loisy was really nearing his end, and that he himself was leaving for Ceffonds.[1]

But that same friend, alas ! was not able to fulfil the last duties, for when Loisy died on June 1 he himself was, in virtue of his public duties, unable to leave Paris; " I cannot go to bury him," he wrote, " as I promised him thirty years ago; and it is cruel. I saw him a month ago, and know that he died at peace with God."

At a time like this it is impossible not to refer to these latest impressions of one whose life had been cast in a very different mould from that into which we are all forced at present.

I must now give some short account of his life before speaking of his work. In his *Memoirs of the Religious History of our Times* (Emile Nourry, 1931) he gives a full biography to date, but briefly we may put the chief facts as follows.

He was born on February 28, 1857, in a village of Champagne (Ambrières). He came of a family of what the French term " cultivateurs "; not labourers but peasant proprietors. His family was profoundly Catholic, and brought him up to the practice of his religion. He would have followed the profession of his forefathers if an illness in infancy had not rendered him unapt for field work. But the love of the soil was ever in him all the same; in his retirement at Ceffonds he worked in his garden so long as his strength held out; and I remember being amused by a remark of his, on an occasion when a learned visitor to a former country home of his had expressed surprise at his interest in his poultry, and had failed to observe what fine birds they were !

However, the illness that checked his bodily activity opened the way to his intellectual career, and after a short period in a lay college, which did not please him, and a further phase of tuition by the curé of his village, he entered the ecclesiastical college of St Dizier, and having determined to become a priest he then entered the seminary of Châlons-sur-Marne.

[1] Ceffonds—par Montier-en-Der—was Loisy's home, in a Loisy country.

Very soon, as he tells us, the critical spirit awoke within him, and he began to feel troubled by the logical precision with which great truths were handled. But he regarded such thoughts as temptations, and, while persisting in a genuinely devout practice of his religion, found intellectual relief in the study of Hebrew. He seems to have passed through a period of considerable stress and mental anguish before being ordained priest on June 29, 1879. After a very short period of parochial work he went to Paris to prepare for a career of teaching. There he came under the influence of Duchesne, who procured for him the professorship of Hebrew and Scripture at the Institut Catholique.

The next influence was that of Renan, whose opinions, he says, he did not adopt, but with whose scientific method he became impregnated.

It is not possible, in this place, to follow each stage of his development, but those who have experienced in their own souls the clash of faith and doubt, and of orthodoxy and faith, will appreciate the drama that was now being unfolded.

" It was impossible," he writes of that time, " for me not soon to realize the radical incompatibility of my general conclusions from critical experience with Roman orthodoxy. This became evident to me in December, 1885, and January, 1886, but without my coming to deny—an important point to note just here—the substantial and fundamental truth of the Christian and Catholic tradition."

And he summed up his determination to remain in the Church, and work for her, in a note of November 15, 1886.[1]

In 1889 he accepted the chair of Sacred Scripture, against the advice of Mgr Duchesne, who thought he would be wiser to devote himself to purely scientific labours, which might be crowned by secular success, and would not expose him to the dangers which Duchesne foresaw for him in the religious field. But Loisy was utterly unworldly, and had so firmly conceived the hope of bringing about a new spirit in ecclesiastical studies that he preferred to follow the course he had appointed for himself. He drew up his proposed course of lectures, of which he gives particulars in his *Memoirs*, and commenced the active accomplishment of his program. His " plan of teaching,"

[1] *Memoirs*, i. 151.

he says, " was simple and clear, and vast enough to occupy my whole life had I been left free to fulfil it."

In 1892 came a definitely hostile move on the part of the Superior of St Sulpice, who forbade the students to attend his lectures; and in 1893 the episcopal authorities of the Institut Catholique withdrew him from the teaching of Scripture or Hebrew. This was the first actual rift between him and his ecclesiastical superiors. He was relegated to the chaplaincy of a convent at Neuilly-sur-Seine, and, curiously enough, his famous work *L'Évangile et l'Église* was in part grounded on lessons given to the pupils of the convent; though of course its controversial nature was not indicated to them. We may add that his relations with the convent remained permanently friendly.

Passing over other works of that period we come to the publication of *L'Évangile et l'Église*: and this work it was, one truly apologetic in its character, as a refutation of Harnack's *Wesen des Christenthums*, and as inspired in part by Newman's *Essay on Development*, that hastened the final crisis of his relations with the Church. The book was condemned by Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris, and other French bishops, in 1903; and eventually, when he was asked to subscribe to the celebrated Encyclical *Pascendi* in 1907, and refused, he was finally excommunicated. From that time he continued his scientific studies without further regard for ecclesiastical pronouncements, and in 1909 he was called to fill the chair of the history of religions at the Collège de France.

His works are well known to those occupied with such studies; and I myself should be quite incapable of analysing or criticizing them. What I should like to do in this place is to give rather a presentment of the twofold aim of his labours as man of science, owing no debt of obedience to any religious authority.

I have said a twofold aim, for I think his aim *was* twofold, and that this fact has not been sufficiently recognized. The first aim was purely scientific; the examination of Scriptural documents, the search for origins, and the study of all religions in their relations to one another and to Christianity. His great work on Sacrifice may be specially cited in this respect.[1] He says in regard to it: " I began

[1] See *Essai historique sur le sacrifice* and *Les mystères païens et le mystère chrétien.*

with sacrifice, for the rites of every religion are its most enduring element, that in which the spirit of each religion is best recognized; and sacrifice has been the first of all rites in ancient religions, if not also in Christianity."

The second aim was human, and, *pace* his orthodox opponents, religious. For I have never met a mind more deeply convinced that humanity cannot be human in the true sense without a religious and spiritual faith; without, in fact, a belief in God, define that belief as you may. And yet he believed, too, that, in his own words, " the existing forms of Christianity were powerless to realize that religion of universal brotherhood which was implied in the Gospel."

First then, in regard to history, there must be nothing but truth, and the stark, unflinching acceptance of facts as they make themselves plain to the mind.

Whether he erred, or not, in some of his factual conceptions is another question, a purely critical one. But, in so far as the mind of the historian was concerned, he held that his one duty was to truth as he saw it. And I should like to observe that he ever showed himself at least as intransigent in his treatment of the anti-Christian critic, when he became a myth-maker, as of the orthodox critic, when he brought theological definitions to bear on what he regarded as historical facts. One might instance his *Histoire et Mythe à propos de Jésus-Christ* (1938), in which he deals with a theory put forward by M. Paul Louis Couchoud, and his *Mandéisme*, in which he treats of the uncritical and mythical character of that doctrine as set forth by later writers. This theory in regard to John Baptist was, for him, a myth without meaning or foundation; and he undertook in that work a refutation of the doctrine which had not been undertaken explicitly by orthodox historians.

But to turn to the second aim of his life and work, I should like, in passing, to record a word he spoke to me in regard to a criticism of his moral and religious opuscles by Baron F. von Hügel, who seems to have given him the impression that he regarded his efforts in that direction as outside his proper sphere, and not to be taken seriously. I cannot recall the precise words in which M. Loisy rebutted this suggestion, but it was something to the effect that his purely critical work could be done by the hour, whereas these other works were the result of original thought and effort.

I think that some day he may be more generally regarded, not only as a great exegete, but also as one who, having

accepted the most adverse conclusions of criticism, stood firm in his spiritual attitude and in his fidelity to Christianity as the greatest spiritual code of humanity. But his critical studies, as well as his religious reflections, had convinced him that no existing religion was truly universal in character.

"All the ancient gods," he wrote, "are inapt to the present crisis, yet there is a God implied in them whose formula must be found."[1]

And again:

"You cannot now satisfy peoples or individuals with tickets of immortality. Here I begin to glimpse the new God, who will be a greater human ideal, greater and truer than the Christ (of the Gospel); even than the (transcendent) Christ of Paul, with his conception of personal sacrifice (immolation) as the ransom of sin; a conception which is inadequate, and must be replaced by simple devotion unto death to the ideal in view."[2]

In another place he says:

"Gradually mankind forms itself a conscience; to some extent this conscience, with us, springs from the Gospel, was prepared thereby, and would not have been born without it—but it goes further."[3]

On this point, whereon, as he knew, my faith and religious conduct differed from his own, a letter he wrote me on April 16, 1922, possesses a certain interest.

I had sent him an article of mine in the *Hibbert Journal* of that month, in which I had set forth another standpoint; one of abiding fidelity to the Church; and he commented thereon as follows:

"Your article seems to me philosophically sound. . . . An historical construction remains an historical construction. Christianity is founded on faith in Christ the Saviour. If this foundation is ruined another religious economy will be necessary. But this other economy is, at the present moment, a mere possibility. And as the world needs an existing religion, your personal attitude is quite defendable; and you set it forth soundly in pp. 408-409."

This sympathy with the believer explains also his close friendship with Henri Bremond, of whose great Christian and Catholic work, *Le Sentiment religieux en France*, he was an assiduous reader.

And in one of his last letters to me he tells me, as a matter of interest, that little Colette Bonnot, the child of his

[1] *Memoirs*, iii. 297. [2] *Memoirs*, iii. 301. [3] *Guerre et Religion*, p. 102.

devoted house companions, was making her first communion.

I recall, too, a pathetic instance at Pontigny, when he was seen listening, outside the church, to the music of the Mass, since his entry would have caused trouble and complication.

And in 1934 I received, from Paul Desjardins, a letter, in which he wrote as follows:

" I must communicate to you a letter from Loisy, that will certainly interest you. It is dated from Ceffonds, December 23, 1934. At least I send the chief passage, which I have copied for you:

' Many learned and philosophers do not see that they are afloat, in the Infinite, just as are mystics. For myself I have the impression of being in an ocean of life, in which religion and science are indefinitely mingled. I have an almost physical impression of this. Not long ago I followed the closure of the Eucharistic Congress at Buenos Ayres on the radio. I heard, as though I were present, the Mass chanted by Cardinal Pacelli; I even received the pontifical blessing at the end. And I felt as though a movement of the total life of our planet, of the universal life, moral and physical, were passing over the electric current. A murmur of the world. Certainly science should be modest, for she is faced by the infinite, and can never wholly embrace it.' "

I give these instances, not to suggest that Loisy retained true belief in Catholicism, but to show that his non-belief was that of one dissatisfied with the inadequacy of existing religions; condemnatory of their intransigence and oppressiveness in regard to science and truth; averse to their spirit of exclusiveness; keenly alive to their partial human failure; but convinced that, in so far as they upheld the spiritual needs and aims of humanity, they were essential to human life in its highest requirements, and worthy of the loyalty of their believers so long as they held the field, and no higher substitute had appeared. " For religions have never been simply systems of arbitrary doctrines from which it would be easy to detach oneself in order to find better ones; they have been, above all, the mystical and transcendent form of social life; the ideal which consecrated that life, and either did or should realize itself in them."[1]

" Christianity is our own human tradition; we can free

[1] *Religion et Humanité*, 1926, p. 8.

ourselves without abandoning it, and those who think they owe nothing to it are greatly deceived."[1]

Loisy was a man of singular purity of mind and heart and devoid of worldly ambition. He had to renounce his Mass and outer religious worship, but his most intimate friend, Louis Canet, told me he kept to the end the habit of daily prayerful meditation. He was sensitive to the point of touchiness, and resented opposition; this made him reckless in the treatment of some of his friends, whom he handled rather mercilessly in his *Memoirs*. I have an idea that he had not the least notion of the pain he might be giving them, and that on this point, as on others, the loneliness of his life was the cause of irritability and thoughtlessness. His life was simple and ascetic, and something of the priestly character remained with him to the end.

Alfred Loisy will take his place in future history as one of the leading exegetes of his day; but even more than that will his figure represent, first, a tragic story of the impingement of science on religion, and religious dogma on science; and next, a life-long effort at more than the conciliation of the two, at a unification of secular and spiritual truth.

History is almost a new science; as minds like that of Loisy came in contact with its irresistible pronouncements they knew that religious truth could not be saved by simply ignoring them. I think the apologetic work of such historians exposed them to greater danger from ecclesiastical authorities than the simple prosecution of their scientific work would have done. But in Loisy's case he probably felt that it was better to pursue his course in perfect freedom, though he by no means abandoned the work of the spirit for purely technical labour.

On some points his position, especially at one period of his career, was irreconcilable with any definite form of Christian faith, and this, chiefly, because he was almost Comtist in his human conception of religion.

But if I am right in my judgment of his later years, then the sense of divine transcendence grew stronger as he witnessed the helpless, hopeless confusions of human society; and I should like to conclude by another quotation from a letter to myself of Paul Desjardins, dated December 23, 1931:

"I was present, on December 5, at the last inaugural

[1] *La Paix des Nations*, 1919, p. 26.

lecture of Loisy (at the Collège de France). He received an enthusiastic reception from the crowded audience. . . . His last phrase . . . was to this effect. *No one shall make us dig the grave of the religion that has nourished us ; we desire rather to be the precursors of its renovation.*"

M. D. Petre.

Meditations of a Bishop

St Clair Donaldson, Bishop of Salisbury and formerly Archbishop of Brisbane, died suddenly of heart rupture on the night of December 6, 1935. He was found on his knees by his bedside the following morning. His biography, by Chancellor Dimont, Bishop Witt-Batty, and other friends, recalls to life again his vigorous personality, and portrays the essential lineaments of a gallant and great-hearted soldier of the Cross. Amongst his effects were found some volumes in manuscript of private meditations, and these, revealing as they do the inner man, strikingly confirm and supplement the impression he made upon his contemporaries.

These meditations are based on the discipline of daily readings from the Bible, to which he devoted the first hour of each day, in the form of an exposition followed by its application for personal use. They cover the whole period of his episcopate of thirty-two years, and they include nearly every book in the Bible—some books twice over. One receives the impression of the enormous value he must have placed on every second of time, as of a mind torn between the importance of his material and the time he can afford to transmit it to paper. The script is evidently written at high pressure, and with such speed as to be only just legible, and sometimes, indeed, not even that.

The meditations do not, on the whole, evince any great originality or profundity of thought; they have breadth rather than depth, practicality rather than brilliance. The exposition of each passage is scholarly, conscientious, "modernist"; but the application is severely searching and practical. The keynote of them all from first to last—their motive and objective—is self-criticism: in substance they form the record of a spiritual autobiography, to read which is not only an inspiration but a rebuke. It is with natural hesitation that one turns the pages which reveal the history

of a man's inner life; it is with greater diffidence that one lifts the veil for all to see. Such exposure may often be not only an indelicacy but a desecration. In this case, however, it is not so. The Bishop's meditations contain no single word that anyone might not read; they reflect simply and transparently the soul of a great Christian gentleman who has nothing to hide, " sans peur et sans reproche." Where the standard is so high and so sustained, selection is difficult in space which is necessarily limited; an attempt must be made, however, to show how a hard-pressed leader of the Church could employ his hours of solitude.

" While I was thus musing the fire kindled." Inevitably these meditations recall the words to the reader. They are written in the language of a kindling spirit, on fire in its ardour for service, its passion for duty, its courageous perseverance in the face of obstacles. Throughout there is the optimistic ring of an eager, glad enthusiasm, the wisdom and discernment born of ripe experience and robust common sense, and a high sense of the responsibility of his calling as a priest and an administrator. He is always in the act of self-detection: whenever his daily reading discovers in him a fault or a lack, the instant resolve is formed to rectify it, there is a prayer for succour to amend or to supply, then on with the next task. " How many find in the Bible only what they want !" he writes. " How many unconsciously force the promptings of conscience into the mould of their own preconceived notions !" And indeed his own meditations are like the delvings of a bold explorer into a mine of truth, who has made up his mind to accept what he finds there, and especially what he does not want to find.

Of the books of the Old Testament perhaps his most sympathetic study is that of Jeremiah (1929). He feels the burden of the prophet's denunciation and the urgency of his witness astonishingly modern in their application.

IV, 5-31. . . . How massive, how unflinching, how persistent, is the moral witness of the Prophets ! Daring to see and describe the truth of the situation, and daring to show its connection with national sin. Here is a sermon of Jeremiah's, just like one of ours. *But it has lived !*

The same spirit is abroad. God give us valour for the Truth. God give us eyes to see and discern the Truth. . . .

XI–XII, 6. . . . *N.B.*—The slumbering things in the Bible ! Superficially, as you pick them up, you read in the Prophets a weary monotony of denunciation. But take a passage and get

below the surface: *now the Reality awakes!* Here is a passage *still alive* with the struggle of the Prophet between obedience to his dread calling and fear of man. . . . Beneath the surface it is all instinct with Life. Only we must dig and delve to bring it out. The Truth is slumbering there: it must be awaked by study and meditation with prayer.

XIV–XV, 9. . . . God's Prophet is also a sentient human being. . . . *N.B.*—The price at which the Prophet stands before the world. Publicly, he may be as a stone wall, a man with a brazen forehead. But inwardly, he is all misgiving and perplexity and shrinking.

(I am a prey to misgivings the moment any opinion or belief of mine is questioned; though I don't really doubt. I fight against them, but seem incapable of dispelling them. Peevish and moody when people seem to cross me.)

XVIII, 18-23. . . . It is of no use to pretend that there is no personal animus here; that Jeremiah's tender compassion for his people precludes the use of such words as these. They are inconsistent with his normal tone; goaded to fury by opposition he hits out. . . .

(Who does not know the temptation to lose patience, the sense of love being exhausted and gone, of bitter desire to be vindicated against opposition, to see opponents punished? By God's mercy these moments are usually temporary. So it was with Jeremiah. . . .)

XX. . . . The inner man comes out (7-18). The Lord has deceived him and made him a failure. Why should he go on speaking when it is nothing but misery?—but then " His word was in my heart as a living fire shut up in my bones . . . and I could not stay."

When we wonder at the *violence* of the Prophets, their uncompromising hostilities, their front of brass, we ask whence do they get their *ascendancy of conviction* which rises above every argument and all pressure from the other side?—v. 9 gives the answer. A force greater than his own will drove him along. This is the prophet's vocation. This driving force is not given to us common folk. And yet—have we any right to excuse ourselves thus for taking a back seat when persecution is abroad? Should *we* not also feel the " fire in our bones " if we had ever wholeheartedly offered ourselves?

XXIII, 1-8. . . . In XXII it was the Sorrow of the Prophet —the deep reservoir of sorrow and pessimism which only one of his strength could contain. *Now* it is the Faith, unshaken by the present and visible odds which are so against him . . . a faith and strength to be won only by mortification of the self-regarding qualities—love of ease, well-being, popularity, self-protectiveness.

(God's cause goes by default in my ministry just for this

reason: I have not mortified my self-protective qualities . . . I am unwilling to suffer for individuals; or for the Church; or for spiritual causes [particular details given in each case]. So again and again I confront a task with inadequate *sorrow* for the abuse to be corrected, *zeal and passion* for reform, *faith and hope* in the possibility of change, etc. πᾶς δὲ ὁ ἀγωνιζόμενος πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται. Am I prepared to pay the price of renunciation, that I may qualify as a trained athlete for the ἀγών, whatever it may be?

23-32. . . . There is something modern, something disquieting in this. The real Word of the Lord in His servant's mouth really accomplishes something. It is "as the fire, as a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces." Can this be said of our sermons? Are we not rather of the false prophets who say "I have dreamed," and dish up some trumpery idea that has come out of our own minds?

XXX–XXXIII. The Book of Hope. . . . There are times when we feel inclined to say (with Jeremiah) of European circumstances to-day, "Thy bruise is incurable, thy wound is grievous." One wonders how there can be a halt called in the landslide of present tendencies. [At a later date (1935) he recurs to the same foreboding. Romans ix 14-21: "Is it fanciful to see in all this a picture of the modern situation? The Christian nations of Europe have been given great privileges, they have had the hegemony over the world's culture and progress. But they have ignored the righteousness of God, and sought to set up 'their own righteousness.' Great elements in Christian nations are apostate from the Faith, and are seeking to establish human morality and human progress on human lines without help from Above. Are we going to see the hegemony pass from them to the non-European races? Is Christ saying of *us*, 'All day long have I stretched forth my hands to a disobedient and gainsaying people'?"]

The above is illustrative of his immense concern for the body politic. But it is for the care of all the churches, and for his own responsibility therein, that he is most deeply concerned. His meditation on the Good Samaritan illustrates the ruthless way in which he took himself to task at times.

Who is my neighbour?—*Anyone in need.* This is the charge the Master brings against my Cloth as a whole. . . . The official ministry is apt to be so sheltered behind its routine and system that it is not trained in mobility or resource in face of natural emergencies. . . . This is *my* besetting sin. Selfish—self-centred—fenced off in bachelor comfort. . . . I avoid emergencies in my neighbours' fortunes with instinctive aversion. Dreadfully afraid of what I may be let in for. . . .

In another context in the same gospel he again hits himself hard:

The Son of Man hath not where to lay His head."—*You* are surrounded with a comfortable home. Ministry to selfishness pure and simple, selfishness of bodily comfort. Regular meals, cool airy rooms, frequent baths and cool change, devoted servants, loyal and congenial friends. It is well that *you* of all men should remember that the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head.

Though he never believed himself called personally to embrace a life of poverty ("I believe God has called me to live in the world—but for that very reason I must learn to renounce it inwardly"), yet the challenge of it seems always to have exercised his mind. His championship of the Homes for Wayfarers in the Brotherhood of St Francis was the practical expression of this. At a much later date—the year before his death—we find him writing as a comment on 1 John iii, 16-18:

The sight of poverty—how does it affect you? You need go no further for judgment. *N.B.*—The danger of indulging ourselves with lofty views which lie outside the way of common experience. There is no subject about which we preach more persistently than the subject of sacrifice. To care for the poor man you meet, "to do him good"—there the *test* of sacrifice begins. You are not "doing him good" by giving him 6d. You do yourself good, or rather you relieve your feelings, and so are able to banish the vision of poverty with comfortable thought that you have relieved it. But in reality you may be "shutting up your bowels of compassion."

Conscious as he could not well help being of his popularity and the success of his work in Australia, he attacks himself unsparingly:

I am officially in the position of a Pharisee. I find it easy to see things from their point of view. I see how sore a strain on their pride, bent of mind, and indeed something higher than that—their religion as they had learnt it from teachers they respected—was applied by the uncompromising strictures of Christ. Could He not have shown a little more sympathy?

(When my administration is criticized, or some difficult demand made unsympathetically upon me, my instinct is to flare out.)

The Pharisees thought themselves the main bulwark of spiritual life of nation, champions of Faith *v.* Sadducee unbelief; they had great traditions of undoubted patriotism behind them.

(All this sort of thing I feel, *re* self and C. of E. But I do want to learn. I want to love Truth best. If we—if I—am wrong, I want to own up, *whoever* takes me to task.)

Elsewhere in similar strain he buffets himself and goads himself to greater exertions:

Col. i, 24. ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλιψέων τοῦ Χτοῦ. Our weariness in our work, our labour, our worries, our sense of failure, our own misgivings and perplexities, our disappointments over persons, over results—is it all " for His Body's sake which is the Church ?" . . . When you have to take that funeral, to ride 12 miles to take a baptism, to spend half a day over accounts which a Ch. Warden has muddled through utter slackness, to prepare an important sermon when you are played out and know it can only be your second best, to feel yourself beaten by a selfish scheming man—all these little details of θλίψεις are your supplementing of what is wanting still. . . .

As long as you remain inactive in face of a great duty, you have no right in the Universe. You will *feel* that you have no right there. But as soon as you have made the brave decision, light-heartedness returns; you have your place again among God's joyous creatures, however hard the battle.

There is no trace of morbid introspection in these self-communings. They are the outpourings of a manly heart intensely in earnest, essentially healthy-minded and forthright. For a man of such strict integrity " an unexamined life could not be livable." Most natures, even those of high purpose, are occasionally betrayed by a sudden outcrop of temperamental weaknesses when they " let themselves go "; the inherent psychological flaw reveals itself, consciously or unconsciously, in moments of relaxation. It is worthy of remark that the very virtues which in Bishop Donaldson were so conspicuous as to appear innate rather than acquired—humility, considerateness and candour—were those of whose opposites he was himself inwardly most conscious.

One would have thought too that spontaneous trust in, and conscious dependence upon, the Divine Providence of God—the fundamental act of faith—was natural to him because it seemed habitual. Yet it was not so; it was the result and reward of intense effort:

" Abba, Father."—I find it hard to embrace the thought of the Fatherhood of God. I think of His Power and Greatness as the Spirit of the Universe: the thought of His Fatherhood

seems almost the offspring of a passing emotion. But no, it is the really transfiguring thing about the soul's experience, and can only be won through God's gift. . . . Lord, teach it me. . . . There *is* a Heavenly Father. He is near. A *Father* rules and guides the Universe. He is my Father. He loves me. He cares for me. He is waiting to give me every good thing. He is the Father of us all, only we are so divided, there is so much evil amongst us that brain and heart fail us when we try to recognize this truth. Well, He is my Father, and presently I shall recognize that He is their Father too.

Of the books of the New Testament it is to the Epistle to the Ephesians that he seems to have given the closest study, yet from a practical rather than from a doctrinal point of view. His concern is not so much with the so-called " economic relations " between the Persons of the Godhead (such abstractions of the discursive reason would doubtless have seemed to him irreverent speculation) as with the relation of Christ to man (for this is vital to life and character). Accordingly, he does not seek to unravel the tortuous web of metaphysical subtleties which later scholasticism spun out of the sublime poetry of St Paul, but he sees in this epistle the high-water mark of aspiration on the part of a rare spiritual genius at the mount of vision, and is awed by it. But, " What reality is there in our experience to correspond with these words ?" he asks; and again, " How hard it is to use these great thoughts practically in our lives !"

Even when the question at issue is of vital practical importance, but admits of no ready solution, his fairmindedness is content to leave the dilemma open; as, for instance, in St Paul's conception of the Church as the Body of Christ:

I, 15-23. St Paul begins to open out his chief subject (and it is simply burning in his mind)—the new conception he has received of the Body of Christ. In this passage he leads up to it. . . . So there *is* a Spiritual Fellowship. It is an objective reality. There is a Household of God (ii, 19). An Holy Temple in the Lord (ii, 21).—But the idea is difficult. . . . The difficulties of exposition begin when we learn that that Person is composite, that Christ includes a vast section of mankind. How is this ? What is the true conception of the Church ? —Three conceptions.

1. *An Ark of Safety* in which the Elect are placed by no choice or merit of their own, but by the deliberate antecedent Purpose of God (Calvinist).

2. *A Net* which will eventually expand to include all mankind. The Love of God cannot be beaten: therefore all will be saved at last (Universalist).
3. *A Home* set to attract men, doors of which are for ever open, because God in His Love wills that all men may be saved. But all will not come in so far as human forecast can ascertain—

   (*a*) ∴ The children, the messengers and witnesses for Christ, give a defective message which puts people off.

   (*b*) ∴ Though the message is faithfully delivered, people's own blindness and wilfulness misinterpret it.

   (*c*) ∴ Although the faithful are not to blame, and people do not misinterpret the message of salvation, yet the *demands* of it are exacting and repel soft, pleasure-loving and cowardly souls.

Against this third view of the Church objection is raised:—if some fail to enter, although God's love wills it, then God's Purpose of Love fails—and that we can't imagine. *Either* we must believe that somehow, at last, Love will prevail, *or* we must conclude that in order that Love may win freely and without compulsion, there must be some limitation of Love's omnipotence.

It is after all only a restatement in simple terms of an age-old theological question, but to his mind it presented itself, not as a subject for academic debate, but as an urgent personal problem crying out for solution. A meditation of a few days later, however, would seem to have given him the answer that satisfied him best:

III, 14-21. The Prayer rises naturally out of the Vision of God's Purpose which he has set forth in i and ii, and again explicitly stated in iii, 2-13. But behind this expression (Gentiles, fellow-heirs, etc.) is a far wider vision of the Universality of the Gospel—that the Purpose of Creation is to unite all things [' men ' written first, and deleted]. So he bursts out into this prayer . . . surely one of the most exalted and passionate prayers in human language.

" All things." A later reading causes him to recur to this. It is worth quoting, the last paragraph especially, not only to show the range and width of his sympathy, but also as a salutary reminder to human beings, preoccupied with their purely human destinies, that there are " other pebbles on the beach."

IV, 7-10. ἵνα πληρώσῃ τὰ πάντα. "*From its depths to its heights He has compassed the Universe.*" (*Cf.* Armitage Robinson.) Christ is to restore the Universe completely to its true order: and for that He must fill all things. *N.B.* how all through Colossians and Ephesians the idea of fulness and fulfilling is prominent.

It is a strange and wonderful revelation! Why the *Universe* should be filled with a Godhead which is also human—has been incarnate in one planet called the Earth—we can't understand. But we may be sure that equal love and equal consideration has been shown by the Godhead to *every other form of created life.*

Does κατώτερα μέρη τῆς γῆς suggest that something analogous to the Incarnation has happened to created life below the level of man? That God has in any sense visited the Fauna and Flora of the world, in addition to His Presence as the Creative Spirit in all things?

Among the more memorable of his thoughts on Ephesians is one with which he concludes his reading of the Prayer and Ascription in iii, 14-21 (above).

Surely unique among the flights of the human spirit towards God! The wonder of what St Paul contemplates not only exalts him personally, but makes him long that his fellow-Christians should see what he sees: but it needs a foundation of strength and knowledge and love before they can do so. Hence his prayer. . . . Great and bold as it is, God is able to do exceeding abundantly, even more than what we are now asking.

. . . I believe in God. He is near. He has lately shown Himself afresh to me. . . . He is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think. And this He can do κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ἐνεργουμένην ἐν ὑμῖν. There *is* Power already in us that can be mobilized into manifestation of Divine Life beyond all we ask or think. *Can it be that such undertakings, such promises, are exhibited before our hungry eyes unless God means so to act?* Can we doubt that our prayers for Unity, Order, and Renewal will be abundantly answered?

We wait for Thy loving-kindness, O Lord.

Enough has been quoted to indicate that prayer was to this servant of God as the very breath of his being, as necessary to his health as oxygen to his lungs. It was the *raison d'être* of all his Bible study and meditations. It is true to say of him that all his life long he agonized in prayer. But it is evident that the problem of unanswered prayer—which is after all beyond all problems, doctrinal or other, the fundamental religious problem—becomes more

pressing with advancing years; and among his comments on Ephesians (1928) we find the following:

I, 3. . . . As life goes on, if we are faithful to our Christian allegiance, we meet with set-backs in our prayers. They are not so strikingly answered. The spiritual outlook grows more confused. We are no longer marching as to trumpets as we seemed to be when every prayer seemed abundantly answered. All this is healthy: it is the Cross beginning to enter into our life, and all the time we can hold on to the butt of the text—"God has blessed us with all spiritual benediction in the heavenly sphere."

I, 11-14. *N.B.* St Paul's intense sense of God. He sees God "working all things according to the counsel of His Will." God is ruling the world, guiding and governing it from day to day.

But how hard this is for the modern mind to accept! So much always happening which we are bound to believe is not the Will of God. . . . Both in the world at large and in our own personal experience we are never absolutely assured as to what God's Will is.—Yes, there *are* difficulties. But we must cling to St Paul's teaching with entire loyalty. "He ordereth all things according to the counsel of His Will." True, evil—man's sin—may hinder and hold up His purposes. But *that* is also according to the counsel of His Will . . . through which He is (1) exposing evil with a view to its final annihilation, (2) testing and bringing out the faith of His servants.—That is my job here and now. To wait in loyalty and confidence even when I don't understand. . . . I believe that He is at work in the C. of E., in the Nation, in the World, in my life. The practical thing to learn is that when untoward things happen, when prayers are not answered, the situation is so willed of God . . . and is somehow the best way of releasing His ultimate Purpose.

Again, in a comment on John xiv, 8-19 (still later):

"Here the Great Promise which stands by us in all details of our life and struggle. *Is* it being fulfilled? Is there help and comfort coming? Is the Life-Personality there?—We must beware of an answer prompted by spiritual habit. We are so accustomed to speak to Him, and think He answers, that it *may* be an obsession. The answer is, at certain times and in certain circs., a Push has come which is so purely from outside that no juggling of psychology can detract from the actual *fact*. And besides, the evidence of my own consciousness, and my experience of His dealings with me, is unanswerable, though inexpressible."

As his life drew on to its sudden unforeseen ending, short ejaculatory prayers became more frequent in his meditations,

as: "Lord, help me *daily* to renew my obedience." "O my God, teach me humility." "Lord, make my love pure."

Life seems for the most part to promise more than it fulfils, and, though the years had indeed brought him cause for thankfulness in the realization of many of his highest hopes, it had not been without its frustrated purposes also, its inexplicable disappointments. But these had not dimmed his vision of the Ideal or quenched the passion of his quest. As the years advanced we find on the pages of his meditations flashes of a new fire, and increasingly so when, little as he guessed it, the time had come "to put down the extinguisher on the lamp, and feel the last grand rush of darkness on the spirit."

It happened that the last book on which he was engaged was the First Epistle to Timothy—the pastoral charge of a veteran, whose time of departure is at hand, to his young lieutenant. ("To St Paul, as to us Bishops to-day, the placing of men is full of anxiety.") He began it in October, 1935, and finished it on December 6, the day before he died.

"It is dark and cloudy now, but it is to the future I look," he writes in one place; and throughout one receives the impression of the settled peace of an evening, not indeed unclouded, but whose clouds are suffused with the kindly radiance of departing day. Significantly he notes the last chapter as the "Jottings of an old and tired man, but how wise and full of human experience!"

. . . . For 72 years Christ has "shown all long-suffering" in my case. Has He not waited, and is He not still waiting, until I make my full surrender? Until I give some return as a minister of the Gospel for all His training and gifts? . . .

He is giving me another chance. God help me to bear fruit this time. Ought I not to *love* Christ for His long-suffering towards me? . . .

It is striking that in a pastoral epistle St Paul says so little about the priest's relationship to Christ, and so much about his relations to his fellow-men. Does it not suggest that in teaching and preaching about the priesthood, we don't insist enough on good citizenship, good neighbourship, and the natural virtues? Here are the characteristics required in the ministers of the Church. Personal self-discipline, a level-headed sober outlook, firmness in discipline, friendliness, hospitality to all.

Through all his meditations, which cover a period of thirty-four years, there was one subject on which the

Bishop had never touched, one word he had never mentioned by way of personal reference—being, indeed, too abundantly blessed with and concerned about life to give a thought to it: that word is death. On the last day of his life, however, and in entire unconsciousness of its significance, the word is mentioned for the first time. (It was the Advent season.)

To keep the commandment until Christ appear again.

What is the commandment? What is the manifestation? Whatever it be there is something we are to hold till we are relieved by a *coming*. There is something to appear in the future. To us, to me, the appearing which relieves us will be Death.

But it seems there is to be an end of the present dispensation: St Paul is surprised that the appearing had not already come. His words are cautious ("in his own time"), but he still expects something.

So he passed as all must pass to the undiscovered country, the bourne of his hopes, with many prayers seemingly unanswered, many aspirations unfulfilled, many perplexities unsolved, not having received the promises but having glimpsed them as it were from afar off.

"For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. . . . But now they desire a better country, that is an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for He hath prepared for them a city."

GEORGE SEAVER.

Memories of Modernists and Others

III—THE GIRTON CONFERENCE OF 1921

WHEN the Conference Committee of the Modern Churchmen's Union announced early in 1921 the subject of the annual conference to be held in August of that year at Girton College, Cambridge, the Bishop of Durham, Dr Hensley Henson, wrote to Alfred Fawkes expressing apprehension. The subject set was to be "Christ and the Creeds," and the Bishop's chief concern was on the ground that it was proposed to discuss the theories of Dr Kirsopp Lake; a course which, in his opinion, might "create another crisis in the matter of belief before we have well made good such liberty as we have." He suggested that Fawkes would

" do wisely to pass on a cautionary message," and gave him authority to make any use of his letter that he wished. Fawkes afterwards wrote to me: " As I am one of his chaplains and was then a member of the Council, the letters seem to me to be reasonable as coming from an *amicus curiae* who was in a position to know the back of the causes." He acted upon the suggestion, and sent the Bishop's letters to sundry eminent members of the Conference Committee. In reply to this they held variously that either it was too late, or otherwise it was undesirable, to change the subject of the forthcoming conference. The conference, therefore, was held according to the original plan, with the addition of a paper (not in the published official program) which was read by Dr Foakes-Jackson, representing Dr Lake and himself.

In view of the intermediary position in which he had been placed, Fawkes remained absent from the conference, but paid me the compliment of asking me to write him an impression of it. I was present for the important papers and the subsequent discussions on the first four mornings, and conveyed an impression as faithfully as I could. Fawkes, as soon as he got a gist of the proceedings, was quick to give a very brief summary criticism of the result of the conference; but in fact he wrote and spoke at considerable length upon its contributions to that conclusion. A few sentences from his next letter will suffice to indicate his attitude. He wrote:

> Many thanks: you tell me just what I wanted to know; and just what I thought would be the case. . . .
>
> I am very glad I was not there; for I should have agreed with no one. Glazebrook was, then, very anti-Lake, urging that he should be asked to resign—a proposal which I should have strongly opposed. Nor did I take Henson's view of Lake's books—which, I think, take critical and historical, rather than speculative, ground. . . . I supported Henson's advice on the ground of its prudence, which seemed to me so obvious that I was amazed at the reception which it met with.

To this letter he added a postscript quoting the observation of one of the conferenciers in a letter to him, that " by the irony of events it is just those members who opposed Foakes-Jackson who have been held up to obloquy in the Press." And he added, " I am not *very* sorry."

[Fawkes had not at that stage seen the sheaf of newspaper

cuttings; but he saw that it was not Lake and Foakes-Jackson, but those who had persisted in bringing them into discussion at the conference, who had " got it in the neck."]

We know well enough the difficulties which beset newspapers when reports have to be given of highly technical papers and discussions; and allowances must be made when contributions to scientific theology are summarized by correspondents who, however careful and conscientious, are not themselves scientific theologians. The late Dr Hastings Rashdall, whose immense learning is everywhere acclaimed even by those who are not of his own philosophical school, obtained damages out of Court on the ground of a quite unwarrantable misrepresentation of his conference paper.

But the publicity which the conference enjoyed, and the vilifications which it incurred, were due as well to other causes as to the actual newspaper reports. When Dr Headlam, then Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, reviewed the conference papers in *The Church Quarterly Review*,[1] he detected an organized campaign directed in the supposed interests of orthodoxy, and noted that this campaign of heresy-hunting exhibited two defects. (1) The first was that it was " singularly unsuccessful," for, whereas it "set out to injure the reputation and authority of modernist Christology," its effect was " to sell more than 6,000 copies of *The Modern Churchman*, a sale for a serious theological work at the present day probably quite unique."[2] " When the purchasers come to read the book which was so violently attacked, they will find that, whatever demerits it may have, it exhibits singular earnestness and sincerity, and often considerable ability. Its objectors will only have succeeded in helping the propagation of these doctrines," and in damaging their own reputation for fairness in controversy. (2) The second defect of the anti-Girton campaign was, he said, that it showed no understanding of intellectual difficulties, and, while pretending to an immaculate orthodoxy, frequently exhibited heresy in its own ranks.

[1] January, 1922. The title of the long article of thirty-two pages was "The Modernist Christology." This illustrates, of course, the loose English use of the term " Modernist," for, as we shall note, it would be fair to say that the dominant colour of the conference was Liberal Protestant.

[2] This figure is reported to have been exceeded by the sale of the late Dr Streeter's *Reality*, which was published at twice the price of the conference number of *The Modern Churchman*.

Dr Headlam's criticisms might be said, with Pope, to "deal damnation round the land"; for having dealt thus heavily with the critics of the conference, he proceeded to an extended criticism of the papers themselves. To this we shall return at the appropriate point. In the meantime the unofficial paper of Dr Foakes-Jackson at the Conference may be said to bring the matter to a head;[1] for, as he said in his opening sentences,

I feel that I am, in part at least, the cause of the choice of this most interesting of subjects, "Christ and the Creeds" . . .
The reason for this choice of the most important of subjects is, I have the vanity to suppose, the publication of the first volume of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, which Professor Lake and I have edited. We have there placed before the English-speaking world an exposition of our theory of the character of primitive Christianity and of the part the Founder took in bringing into being the Church with its dogmas and theory of life.

Then he proceeded:

Hitherto English commentators have displayed a tendency to work either for the edification of the readers or the advancement of their particular Church;[2] and they have looked to the dogmatic inferences which might be drawn from their statements. We, on the contrary, have followed the continental method in endeavouring to produce, as far as lay in our power, a simple statement of the condition of primitive Christianity, and to invite our critics to correct us if we were in error. In so doing we were fully aware that we laid ourselves open to reprobation.

But more than this; since the tone and temper of the conference — with exceptions such as the late Professor Burkitt among contributors to the discussions—would perhaps most correctly be described as Liberal Protestant, it could hardly relish the somewhat bitter pill which Dr. Foakes-Jackson provided for it:

On the continent our work has been well received and appreciatively discussed, as it has been also in Scotland, and in the Nonconformist and non-sectarian newspapers. We have been most severely rebuked by the Liberals of our own Church, who have my sincere sympathy. They are fighting a hard fight.

[1] *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1921, at pp. 228 *ff.*

[2] This allegation recalls the saying of a friend of mine that "English theology often gives the impression of having been written to the sound of church bells."

On the one hand, they see that they are losing the support of the public because there is little demand for a reasonable presentation of Christianity. People are not saying as they did formerly, "Give up your impossible dogmas and the evident myths on which they are based, and let us have a plain statement of the essentials of Christianity." The day for such lectures as Harnack's *What is Christianity?* is over. There is a growing conviction, not the less dangerous because it now rarely finds a voice, that Christianity can be ignored.

But whereas, he said (if we may briefly paraphrase), the need was to arouse men to shake off this lethargy and cause people to realize the importance of religion, the weakness of the Liberal Christianity which was attempting to do this was that it was unhistorical; for in place of the historical Christ it presented a social reformer, a moral legislator *et id genus omne*, unknown to primitive Christianity and derived from the Synoptic Gospels. Yet he did not dissent from the view that "the creation of the Jesus of the Synoptists was too original a feat for any writer or group of writers to have accomplished," but from the assumption that the Synoptic Jesus was the subject of primitive preaching; and endorsed what was said by a friend:

> The Synoptic portrait of Jesus is not a product of the Church theology, but something which has survived in spite of it.

The Synoptics stood in contrast both with the primitive preaching and with the Fourth Gospel, which is (in Dr Lake's words) "the true foundation document of Catholic Christianity." The effect of the adoption of the continental method was to cause the Liberals to feel that *Beginnings* gave them, in the cold facts of primitive Christianity, nothing but "stones for bread." The authors could have propitiated Liberal piety by an elaboration of the Synoptic portrait of the Founder, but this would not have been true to the primitive picture; for "a Christ based on the first three Gospels . . . eludes their grasp, because this was not what the Church at first accepted." Again, the authors of *Beginnings* could have satisfied the Sacramentalists by a word—beyond the mere statement that Sacraments in some sort were pre-Christian, but not Jewish—to the effect that

> if the Christian mysteries were Greek rather than Jewish, it was because the pagan world was realizing the need of communion with God by some visible means. . . .

but that

whilst all other "mysteries" had vanished, the Christian Eucharist still supplies the Catholick with a real communion with God.

But the authors did not succumb to these temptations because they

were convinced that the present time is one in which the Church needs a plain statement of the difficulties of modern Christianity, that it may realize where it stands.

The conference, as a whole, was unfavourably disposed to the position of Drs Lake and Foakes-Jackson; but the effect of this was not to "whitewash" the conference. For, as we noted, it was the official spokesmen of the conference who suffered from reports and attacks in the Press. The attack upon the authors of *Beginnings* came from the conference and its friends. After Dr Foakes-Jackson's expressed contempt of the Liberals, I was one of a party which included Professor Burkitt and Dr Foakes-Jackson himself. There I heard the remark that sundry eminent "Modern Churchmen" at the conference were not even "Liberals," but had only some "liberal elements"; and Dr Foakes-Jackson said of the expressed hostility to Dr Lake, "Why, Lake would sweep the floor with the whole bench of English bishops."

At an early date after the publicity which followed the conference was in full swing, a former secretary of the Modern Churchmen's Union, Mr Manning, Rector of Barnet, published his resignation of his membership of the Union; for, having read only some newspaper reports of the contributions of his fellow Liberals, he expressed the opinion that "that crew will never pull the ship along." He knew the Liberal Protestant position of his *quondam* friends; but having hitched his waggon to the tail of a bishop he had ceased to toy with academic difficulties, and I realized that he did but imperfectly grasp the currents at Girton and knew nothing at all of Lake, Foakes-Jackson and *Beginnings*.

Fawkes noted this last event in a letter in which he expected that there would be other resignations as a result of "this folly"; and he enclosed another letter from the Bishop of Durham regretting the fulfilment of his worst fears. Fawkes then proceeded:

I find myself making Catholick parallels. Lake is like Loisy, who goes whither the thought leads; the C.U. (*sic*; now M.C.U.) is like Batiffol, who tried, unsuccessfully, to whitewash himself by denouncing Loisy: Henson is like Leo XIII, who did not much like Modernism, but knew that it called for very careful dealing—one may apply the words, "*qui mange le Pape en meurt*"; I am like Duchesne, resolved not to venture on the quicksands of dogma, but to confine myself to history and criticism; the Archbishop is like the Curia, keen to make profit for the hierarchy out of the blunders of its opponents.

A month later he returned to this theme:

I have no sympathy with the attack on Lake. . . . But I recall Duchesne's saying when Batiffol, to shield himself, attacked Loisy: "*c'est une vieille cocotte qui offre le pain bénit dans sa parvisse, en jetant des regards de mépris sur les filles-mères.*"

And again when he had seen the published papers he said:

I think myself that to say that the views expressed at Girton are in any sense those of the Creeds, the Councils or "Catholicism" is nonsense.

And he repeated what he had said soon after the conference that

there *was* an ante-Nicene age, and this, I think, is the key to the controversy.

But it was far from being an end of the controversy; for not only did Dr Henson castigate the Girtonians at the Church Congress of that autumn, although he was opposed to any action being taken; but Dr Headlam, in his review of the Conference Papers, exhibited a fairly well distributed acerbity. A pat on the back which he gave to three of the readers of papers was quite exceptional in proportion to the volume of his criticisms of Dr Glazebrook, Dr Rashdall, Professor Bethune-Baker, and Dr Barnes (then a Canon of Westminster), none of whom escaped his "apostolick blows and knocks." But his principal invective was discharged at Drs Lake and Foakes-Jackson, whose position the conference liked no better than he did. He was so incensed by the insinuation that English theology is written for edification that he allowed himself to refer to "Dr Lake and Dr Jackson, quite second-rate scholars", and to speak of "the superficial peckings of Dr Lake."

It is true that the late Master of Jesus described

Dr Foakes-Jackson as a "born journalist" (but this quality rendered him a more effective vehicle of his theological scholarship); just as Dr Lake dedicated *The Stewardship of Faith* to F. J. F. J. ΔΙΟΡΘΩΤΗΙ ΣΠΟΥΔΑΙΟΤΑΤΩΙ. Perhaps Dr Headlam felt that he could lavish disrespect upon a mere journalist and corrector; but his further reference to Dr Lake must be regarded as reckless.[1] For it was their conclusions, not the intensity of their researches, which were held to be open to question. Dr Barnes was no friendly critic of these authors, but his criticism was a testimony to the thoroughness of their work: "The authors of such a book as *The Beginnings of Christianity* appear to reach what we may not unfairly term rejective conclusions by an ingenuity of atomic disintegration which a physicist might envy."[2]

Years afterwards Alfred Fawkes looked upon the Girton Conference in the retrospect, and expressed the opinion that it had after all been beneficial in clearing the air. Victorian though he was in age, he saw the force of Professor Burkitt's simile which likened the Victorian Liberal Churchman to a man who looked into a well and pictured primitive Christianity in the reflection of his own face. Therefore he approved the dispassionate researches of the authors of *Beginnings*, even though he could not accept all their conclusions; for he held to what he had written years before in his essay, "The Development of Christian Institutions and

[1] Dr Headlam has now been Bishop of Gloucester for seventeen years; but in academic criticism there is no respect of persons, and the wheel may be said to have come full circle; for Professor Guignebert, of the Sorbonne, in his *Jesus* (translated into English), thus refers to Dr Headlam's *Life and Teaching of Jesus*: "This author has a capacity for confidence in the Gospel texts, which is only equalled by his critical incompetence."

[2] *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1921, at p. 258.

I recall the late Sir Edwyn Hoskyns saying that, whether he could accept Lake's conclusions or not, he realized that Lake's knowledge of Christian origins was unrivalled among English-speaking theologians.

And it may be noted that Dr Goudge, who afterwards succeeded Dr Headlam as Regius Professor of Divinity, referring to the Girton Conference and the merits and defects of the Liberal Protestant group, described Dr Foakes-Jackson's appearance at the conference "as a sort of accusing historical conscience." For "he and his fellow-worker see what the others do not see—that the message of the Church as it appears in the New Testament is essentially Catholic, and that the fact must be explained." *Vide C.Q.R.*, January, 1922, art. "Catholicism and Liberal Christianity," at p. 337.

Beliefs," " it is hopeless to attempt to understand primitive Christianity till we have ceased to look at it from the standpoint of the Christianity of today."[1]

J. F. W. Boden-Worsley.

(*Concluded.*)

In Defence of Criticism

In the March number of Theology Mr C. S. Lewis made some remarkable comments on the relation of literary culture to Christianity. These were avowedly provoked by an article of mine upon a particular group of modern literary critics. These comments have in their turn provoked two exceedingly interesting articles by Mr Bethell and Mr Carritt. But I think it is due to Mr Lewis that, even after all that they have said in defence of the place of culture in the Christian life, I should still make a further attempt to explain what I meant, when I suggested that the state of Christian taste was a source of scandal to some non-Christians.

First of all I do not believe that any serious and intelligent sceptic is scandalized by the affection of quite uneducated Christians for sentimental postcards and statues and even for rather silly novels. They may deplore this, but they know that the preferences of these people are largely determined for them by social influences which the Church no longer moulds. When the Church had more influence on the standards accepted by society at large, which are the only standards known to the majority, the general level of taste was very much higher. No admirer of Byzantine, Gothic, and Renaissance art will deny this, even if they think that the good influence was the influence of religion, not of Christianity, and point to the excellences of Chinese and Japanese painting and Egyptian sculpture. Scandal is given not by the influence of Christianity upon popular art, which seems to have been thoroughly good in most ages of Christian history, but by the present-day preferences of educated Christians, and especially of the clergy, as illustrated in the prevailing standards of church furniture, hymnody, and liturgical improvisation, and in the novels

[1] *Harvard Theological Review*, April, 1917, at p. 113.

to be found in clergymen's libraries. And I do not believe that it is the saints who give serious scandal. Personally, I found a visit to Ars a painful experience, but I do not think that an unbeliever who was not already bitterly prejudiced against the faith would be further disturbed at the thought of the exceedingly poor and crude quality of the holy curé's visual imagination. After all, he was a specialist, and all specialists are apt to be undeveloped in some direction or other; form and colour were not his strong suit.[1] What is disturbing is the general mediocrity of fairly well educated Christian taste, and perhaps particularly of clerical taste. The point was put in a poem in *Time and Tide* just over a year ago about a minister's son in reaction against " the art of reconciling science and religion " in the technical college, who opened the door of a convent chapel, and found, not

> The arabesques of the past, her intricate designs,

but

> Gas jets shone greenly on the pitch pine pews.
> An enormous figure of St Joseph,
> His gown maroon, threw a distorted shadow.
> Wax paper, printed with magenta angels,
> covered the windows: the brass vases held
> pink cotton roses. Hymn books in paper covers—
> cautiously opening one, he found no Latin but crude English—
> brought to mind the baptist chapel's Festival of Song.
> Odour of varnish, eclipsing the incense, took him
> back to the college corridors.
> There was no worshipper to teach him piety,
> he did not know there was anything to learn
> from the pink cotton roses.
> Outside again, he shut the door and knew
> one way of escape was now for ever closed.

Some people think this important because they believe that the kind of poetry and painting which is made and valued in any social group at any period is a most important indication of the real standards of value in that group at that period. A change in style is a symptom of a deeper change in men's way of living and thinking and feeling. If they see a startling contrast between French ecclesiastical art in the Middle Ages and the seventeenth century, and what is usually called " Saint-Sulpicerie," they imagine

[1] I don't think anyone is scandalized by the political naïveté of St Edward the Confessor.

that something very significant must have happened to the French Church between the time of Racine and the time of the Second Empire. If they see little difference between the creations and preferences of modern English Christians and those of modern English Liberals, they are naturally inclined to think that there is little difference between the standards of value of Liberalism and of Anglican Christianity. And if standards of value depend upon beliefs, whether those beliefs are consciously held or rather unconsciously felt, it may well be argued that there are important indications from the evidence of art and culture that the real beliefs of French Roman Catholics are not what they were in the seventeenth century, and that the real beliefs of the majority of Anglicans are not very different from those of liberal-minded and humanitarian agnostics.

I think that this argument does not sufficiently allow for social factors which may make the expression of Christian belief in words or in paint more difficult without impairing the belief itself, and I am more certain of the validity of this objection than I was when I wrote my original article on *Scrutiny*, to which Mr Lewis objected. I now think that a great deal which is unsatisfactory in modern Christian art ought to be explained by the great difficulty which Christians have in communicating the Christian view of life to a mixed audience, some of whom are Christians, some agnostics, and some indefinite in their belief or unbelief. Whereas in earlier ages the artist shared his most serious thoughts and feelings with his public, he is now aware that what is common to us all is our practical way of life, our methods of drinking coffee and wearing trousers, and the conventions of our day-to-day conduct, rather than our inner thoughts and feelings and values. The artist who needs for his purpose to communicate with a large and varied public is obliged to be naturalistic and realistic, because he has no common symbolism which he shares with them except the language of representation of outward appearances. In the same way the preacher or the hymn writer is obliged to moralize on the effects of the faith upon practical conduct and social stability if he is to apologize for Christianity before the modern liberal-minded English and American middle-class audience, who understand that frame of reference best. But there is a real danger if the result of this is to impress upon the imagination of ordinary simple Christians a portrait of our Lord in which His divinity is hidden, not revealed, in His

humanity, and an idea of Christian doctrine as a means to inspire ethical uplift and effort or social reform and security.

The criticisms of those outside the Church may very easily assume that Christians have no more than they can put into a Christmas card for common circulation, or into a mission hymn, and such criticisms may miss the mark. But it does not follow that they are not worth very close attention. For very few of us do know how much or how little we have said or read in a poem or in a painting or in a piece of architecture, and that is where the trained critic can be of use. The primary business of the critic, as Dr Richards and Dr Leavis both conceive it, is not to impose his own valuations, but to teach us how to read. There is good Christian authority for making this a most important part of our education. After all, the patristic and medieval school and university curriculum, which the Church controlled and fostered, began with grammar and rhetoric and dialectic. Only when the student had mastered these was he allowed to go on to philosophy and theology. And it is only since education has become secularized that it has become so much more concerned with information about literature and history and science, and so much less concerned with teaching us how to read, and how to compose, and how to think. The educational program of *Scrutiny* seems to me to be in large part, albeit unconsciously, a return to the good traditions of the first two subjects, grammar and rhetoric, in the medieval trivium. These French education has retained, as it has also retained school logic, but English education has suffered the traditional elementary curriculum to be ruined first by irrelevant quarrels about the retention of Latin, and then by the advent of such " practically useful " subjects as geography and commercial French.

I think that Mr Lewis has misunderstood my meaning partly because I chose my examples indiscreetly. If theologically educated Christians knew what they were reading and appreciating I am sure that they would not waste time over Charles Morgan and A. E. Housman, and I do not think that they would attach so much importance to the later novels and plays of Miss Dorothy Sayers as they often apparently do. But it does not by any means follow that they would accept without modification the *Scrutiny* valuations. In choosing D. H. Lawrence, James Joyce, and E. M. Forster as the obvious alternatives I probably

seemed to imply such an uncritical acceptance, but that was not what I meant at all, and indeed the rest of the article ought to have shown Mr Lewis that I do not think that *Scrutiny* has always been right about D. H. Lawrence. Mr T. S. Eliot has something important to say about him too. But I did not want to imply that Christians ought to like only Christian authors, of the present or of the past. Such a contention would be contrary to the great tradition of Christian education, which made Virgil and Sophocles "classical," and it would be, I think, theologically dangerous. We may find authors profitable but unsatisfactory, as we may also find Christian authors who are satisfactory so far as they go, but tell us nothing that is worth the trouble of reading. And we may find authors who are both unsatisfactory and unprofitable, as the great majority of the moderns are. The problem for the common reader is to discover which is which, and there Mr Lewis should allow that education and literary criticism are of use.

But he asserts that they are of use for the soul and not for the spirit. I find it hard to see how the spirit can be saved if the soul is wasting its time in foolish and debilitating ways. For our leisure occupations, what Mr Lewis would call our pleasure and our play, have more and more effect upon many of us as our work ceases to be interesting. What was at one time only a problem for a leisured class, who had to be specially educated to deal with it, is now a problem, and a more acute and more dangerous problem, for the great majority of people in an industrialized society. The craftsman or the small crofter of the old agrarian days was in a very important sense an educated man, educated into an understanding of his materials, his tools, and his work, even if he had no book-learning. In his leisure, such as it was, his work and his family occupied his thoughts, and doubtless similar professional preoccupations took up much of the time of the conscientious country clergyman or country squire. But now more and more people spend fixed hours in an office, or a shop, or a factory, doing work that carries with it no responsibility and not very much interest. Inevitably their interests, their moral attitudes, the state of their souls, the salvation of their spirits (if Mr Lewis will separate soul from spirit), must humanly speaking depend on the way in which they use their leisure; and that must depend in great part on something which we can only call taste.

Matthew Arnold never said that culture was virtue. He said that a right understanding of the Bible, which in his view only culture could give, was necessary to good conduct, as Dr Richards says that an appreciation of poetry is valuable, if not absolutely necessary, for psychological balance. Both these writers seem to me to make taste or critical sensibility an aid to virtue. If anyone says that it is the only aid to virtue, or that it is absolutely necessary to virtue in the individual person, I am quite ready to say with Mr Lewis, "Let him be anathema." But it never occurred to me that Dr Leavis or Dr Knights or any other member of the *Scrutiny* group could hold that doctrine in any objectionable form. There is a form in which it seems to me to be unobjectionable, though confusing, as when in some of Mrs Leavis's articles in *Scrutiny* the sense, patience, and humility of working women are invoked as a foil to the pretentious bad taste of left-wing women novelists. Then good taste becomes for the moment virtue, because virtue becomes the only true and sound source of good taste.

Like Mr Bethell, I look forward to the coming of a company of Christian critics who are sufficiently clear about theological and moral principles to be able to take literary criticism seriously without mixing it up with theology and ethics and psychology, as Arnold and Richards so often do, and Dr Leavis sometimes does unwittingly. I have no doubt that their criticism, as criticism, will often be more satisfactory than that of the *Scrutiny* group, but we must use what aids to reading we can while we have them, as our fathers used Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian in their grammar and rhetoric course. Such a course seems to me to be necessary, not for all Christians in all ages, but for all who have leisure time to use or to waste in reading and recreation in all ages, as the medieval clerks and the Roman nobility had, and for a very much greater proportion, if not the whole of the people to-day, because they are more and more exposed to the same temptations which in earlier ages beset only a very few. Whether this state of affairs will continue is another matter. It is possible to hope that universal education, which only began in the last century, will end in this century or in the next one, but while it is there we cannot afford to allow it to consist of snippets of information without principles of discrimination. I have tried to discuss these questions more adequately in a little book, which I hope that Mr Lewis will read with patience.

I believe that our differences are largely due to a misunderstanding, which is itself the result of very different likes and dislikes.

George Every, S.S.M.

Christian News

In the midst of the "News-Letters" that Commander King-Hall and others have been producing, there has recently appeared a "Christian News-Letter." What are we to think of this? Is it a real sign that Christianity has taken such deep root among us that the most "secular" features of our national life are pervaded with its influence? Or does it merely indicate how lightly we have come to take this word "Christian" upon our lips? In either case the very name of this new effort brings before us very vividly the whole problem of the nature of Christian journalism.

Most of us tend to consider it a little ridiculous that a Calvinistic university in Amsterdam should set itself to teach not only Calvinist theology but Calvinist philosophy and politics and even Calvinist grammar and physics; and we should not find it much less ridiculous if the word "Christian" were substituted for the word "Calvinist." What could "Christian grammar" or "Christian physics" possibly mean? But if this is ridiculous, why is it any more sensible to talk about "Christian journalism," and even about a "Christian News-Letter," and, presumably, "Christian news"? What is "Christian news"?

It can at least be said that this modern attempt to produce "Christian news" is not without precedent, and one precedent especially is still well worth studying. I mean John Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*, which, being written largely in the midst of the events it describes, is much more of a "news-sheet" than a history in the ordinary sense. If we dip into *this* "Christian News-Letter" we shall not need to dip very deeply before discovering that there was only one piece of "Christian news" in which its author was really interested—the one that we call "the Good News," the Gospel, or, to use Knox's own term, the "Evangel."

Knox's *History*, in the words of its sub-title, sets out to tell

" the maner and by what persons the light of Christis Evangell hath bene manifested unto this realme, after that horrible and universall defectioun from the trewth, which hes cum by the meanes of that Romane Antichrist."[1] When he describes the passing of a law permitting Scotsmen to read the Bible in their own tongue, he does not treat it as a mere human political event, but as " no small victorie of Christ Jesus, feghting against the conjured ennemyes of his veritie."[2] Perhaps Dr W. A. Visser t'Hooft had passages of this kind in his mind when, at the World Christian Youth Conference at Amsterdam, he told delegates who were reporting it that they might report discussions on political subjects, but urged them " not to report them politically."

Knox plainly regards as his principal items of news the various declarations, covenants, and confessions of faith which he freely reproduces in his pages, his chief news of all being the stirring Scots Confession drawn up in 1560. It is, moreover, quite evident that in taking the trouble to give us the full contents of this last document, Knox does not merely mean to draw our attention to a brilliant little piece of work that he and his friends produced at such and such a date. Not only the story of its drawing up and subscription, but the story which constitutes its main contents, the story of God's redemptive action which it takes from the Bible, is " news " for Knox, and the most important news—in a sense the only news—in his whole *History*.

It may even be said that this Confession is still " news " for us to-day. Listen, for instance, to what it says of the Day of Judgment: " The remembrance of quhilk day, and of the Judgement to be executed in the same, is not onelie to us ane brydle, whereby our carnal lustes are refrained, but alswa sik inestimable comfort, that nether may the threatning of worldly Princes, nether zit the feare of temporal death and present danger, move us to renounce and forsake that blessed societie, quhilk we the members have with our Head and onlie Mediator Christ Jesus: Whom we confesse and avow to be the Messias promised, the onelie Head of his Kirk, our just Lawgiver, our onlie hie Priest, Advocate and Mediator. In quhilk honoures and offices, gif man or Angell presume to intruse themself, we utterlie detest and abhorre them, as blasphemous to our Soveraigne and supreme

[1] *The Works of John Knox*, Laing's edition, vol. i, p. 1. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 100.

Governour CHRIST JESUS."[1] Is there not "news" in the announcement that the future finally lies in the hands of no one else but this Mediator, even at a time when "worldly Princes" are again "presuming to intruse themself into his honoures and offices"?—and when we are tempted to think that they will "get away with it," that "history is on their side," or at least that they can only be brought to nought if we too cast off the checks and "brydles" of Christian men and set out with no thought but to "beat them at their own game."

Confessions of Faith are also being written to-day in some countries, and they too may be "news"—even in the sense of finding their way into the ordinary press. Karl Barth's "eight theses" against Nazism, in *The Church and the Political Problem of our Day*, have been the subject of keen discussion in the daily papers of Switzerland, where they have been felt to compromise that country's neutrality towards Germany. The *Scotsman* and *Public Opinion* published the text of the theological declaration made by the German Confessional Church at Barmen in 1934; and in 1937 the New Zealand daily newspapers published the text of a correspondence between the German Confessional Church and the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, expressing their "community of faith." No doubt these Confessions, like those which Knox "reported," are copied out in detail partly because people feel—even if only half-consciously—that not only the story of their drawing up by men, but the story of God's "mighty work" which they actually contain, is still news worth reading about. It is good to read not only that this man or that has proved himself ready to go to a concentration camp for his faith, but also that "Jesus Christ, as He is revealed to us in the Holy Gospel"—a living person, Who continues to "make history"—"*is* the only word of God which we have to trust and to obey, in life and in death."[2]

But the "news value" of our confessions of faith and of the "Evangel" which we proclaim is not always as obvious as this; again and again it has to be concretely *shown*. Often, indeed, the confessions of faith themselves contain sentences in which the Gospel is given a more or less "topical" expression. The Scots Confession, after speaking of the Church Universal, goes on to speak of

[1] *Op. cit.*, vol. ii, p. 103. [2] Confession of the Synod of Barmen, Art. 1.

" particular Kirks, sik as wes in *Corinthus*, *Galatea*, *Ephesus* and uther places, in quhilk the ministrie wes planted be *Paull*, and were of himselfe named the kirks of God. And sik kirks, we the inhabitantis of the Realme of *Scotland*, professoris of *Christ Jesus*, professis ourself is to have in our citties, townes, and places reformed."[1] Fundamentally, Knox's *History* as a whole simply aims at making it clearer still that the " Church " about which and to which the New Testament speaks—the Church which we are there told God is keeping in existence between Christ's first coming and His second—means not only Paul and Peter and Apollos and Philemon and Onesimus, but George Wishart and John Knox and the Earl of Aran and Paul Crawar the Bohemian and countless noble or simple people in the Scotland of his day. It is not merely a tale of how the Bible came into Scotland—it is an attempt to put Scotland into the Bible.

Nor is it only the " Kirk " of Scotland which Knox submits to this treatment. For he recognized that the Bible itself demands more. The Bible speaks not only of the Church but also of " powers that be "—of a *political order* within which the Church's task is to be performed until God's Kingdom comes. And these " powers that be " are not only Augustus and Claudius and Nero. Implicitly the Bible speaks at the same time in these passages of Mary Queen of Scots and " Hary the Eight " and Queen Elizabeth—and, naturally, of Hitler and Stalin and Lord Halifax and Mr Chamberlain. These too have their place and their part in " the Good News," and in them also the " Christian journalist " has his own proper interest. The Scots Confession does not mention the rulers of Scotland as specifically as it does the Kirks of Scotland; but they find a place in the " Negative Confession " or " National Covenant " of twenty years later, which ends with a somewhat shrewdly worded oath of allegiance: " And because we perceave that the quyetness and stabilitie of our Religion and Kirk doth depend upon the safety and good behaviour of the Kingis Majestie, as upon ane comfortable instrument, of Godis mercie granted to this countrey, for the meinteining of his Kirk and ministration of justice amongs us; We protest and promeis solemnetlie with our heartis . . . that we sall defend his personne and authoritie with our geare, bodies, and lyves, in the defence of *Christis* Evangell, libertie of our countrey, ministration of justice, and punish-

[1] *The Works of John Knox*, vol. ii, pp. 110-111.

ment of iniquitie, againis all enemies, within this realme or without." In particularizing about Queen Mary and her counsellors, Knox was again merely going a little farther in the direction of concreteness than might be gone in a confession of faith itself.

If we take the Scottish Reformer as our guide, the task of "Christian journalism" now hardly needs further description. The "Christian journalist" as such has only one "story"—the "old, old story." "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified." "Christian journalism" cannot, fundamentally, mean anything else but preaching and theology. In so far as it is not that, it may still be journalism, and even good journalism, but to call it "Christian" is only playing foolishly with words. But perhaps it can tell the Bible story with a special emphasis on the fact that it is not only a story about people who lived hundreds of years ago, but is just as much a story about ourselves, and about the people who fill the pages of our newspapers.

Arthur N. Prior.

MISCELLANEA

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Miss PETRE wrote the *Life of Father Tyrrell*; her own autobiography, *My Way of Faith*, was published by Dent in 1937.

The Rev. GEORGE SEAVER is the Sub-Warden of St Deiniol's Library, Hawarden.

The Rev. J. F. W. BODEN-WORSLEY is the Rector of North Wingfield, Derbyshire.

Brother GEORGE EVERY is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

Mr PRIOR was formerly a Lecturer in Philosophy at the University of Otago, New Zealand.

Mr WINTON THOMAS is Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Cambridge.

The Rev. GEOFFREY ALLEN was, until recently, on the staff of the Canton Union Theological College.

NOTES

THE TWO CITIES

(*Die Polis in Kirche und Welt.* By K. L. Schmidt. Zollikon-Zürich, 1939.)

THIS is a most pertinent study by a distinguished New Testament scholar, who is well known in this country and who was recently denationalized by the German Government as a Christian opponent of Nazism.

Propaganda and catchwords nowadays are continually threatening man's clarity of thought and with it man's purity of soul. Consistent meditation on the real meaning of human words is one of the few weapons still left to mankind in to-day's onslaught of barbarism. Professor Schmidt gives us an example of how we may again use our words as they are meant to be used —*viz.*, by returning to the source of Divine reality and inspiration.

This philological and lexicographical research is always aiming at a theological exegesis. The first two sections explain the word πόλις, its derivations in ancient and Hellenistic use and in the New Testament. This leads up to a conclusion of striking theological significance. The Greek πολιτεύματα in foreign countries are the second fatherlands, homes, colonies of the true fatherland, the Greek πόλις. This in the New Testament provides the means for expressing the true relation between Church and World (Phil. iii, 20). Christian citizenship has its essence in heaven, we are a "colony of heaven" (Moffatt).

This *vis-à-vis* of the earthly cities to the heavenly abiding city

(Heb. xiii, 14) is further developed in the third section. The pagan μεγαλόπολις (Babylon, Rome) and the earthly Jewish Jerusalem are confronted with the Christian city to come, the heavenly Jerusalem. Through man's rejection of Christ the earthly Jerusalem changes from a biblical ἁγία πόλις into another pagan μεγάλη πόλις (Rev. xi, 8) or into a mere Greek ἱερὰ πόλις (Josephus, Philo). But God's faithfulness towards the first chosen city and citizens remains. The new Christian city is still Jerusalem, and the Jews will have to play their part in it. Christ revealed as a Jew in the earthly Jerusalem and Christ now with us every day is already the presence of the heavenly Jerusalem, the Kingdom of God personified. We may add that Christians, as far as Christ's Spirit has moulded them into a true membership of His body, represent also themselves the presence of the heavenly city.

The following three sections lead back from God's Word to what man's words have made out of it. It is a rather discouraging view. A gradual dissolution of the true *vis-à-vis* of the earthly and the heavenly cities, of the World and the Church, seems to be going on. The Church's hope for God's Kingdom seems to vanish more and more in the post-biblical writings from the Apostolic fathers through the early Christian Apologists up to Clement and Origen of Alexandria. Instead of God's claim in the dawning of His Kingdom, man's individual consummation through human virtue becomes the predominant thought. This individual perfection is seen mostly in a Utopian connexion with a cosmopolitan world government of the Church to come on earth. We discern already the lines leading to St Augustine's *Civitas Dei.*

On the other hand, human thought influenced by Stoic self-sufficiency is going to be content with a heavenly city in man's soul only. We may add that the very possibility of a Divine redemption of the body as well as of the present human political order is denied by the later Greek dualism and its extreme negation of our bodily and political life.

Nevertheless it seems to me that there is a way in which the special English attachment to the Greek fathers may be justified. If we would endeavour to be more conscious than they were of the necessity of thinking on decidedly Christian eschatological lines, all these wonderful conceptions may well serve to enrich the picture of our Christian hope and to direct our Christian actions. What the Greek called " the immortal soul " would then be recognized as the consciousness of God's grace in His children. And in this consciousness, which is the gift of God's Holy Spirit, we cannot help aiming at moral virtue and political justice although knowing that we cannot attain to their perfect embodiment here on earth.

Still there is no doubt that Professor Schmidt's results are confirmed by what he shows us farther on. Origen and the

Greek Jew Philo are specially dealt with as outstanding representatives of the Greek aberration towards a mere cosmo-political and psychological view of the heavenly city. A summary on the Greek (and Roman) πόλις doctrine from Heraclitus up to Aristotle, the Stoics and Cicero shows clearly that the enormous tension of Greek political thought, fluctuating between idealism and sophism, right and might, mythical and mystical religious foundations of the commonwealth and mere utilitarianism, nowhere transcends the human sphere. I think our modern idealism, secular and Jewish as well as Christian, is subject to the same criticism.

Professor Schmidt points out that the earthly order always remains on the other side of the Church, which alone whole-heartedly is directed towards the heavenly city. This is the assured result of his study. But he does not deny that the earthly political order is of preliminary importance in God's plan and purpose. We may therefore still hope, not for the final peace of heaven on earth, but for more peace and love in men's hearts and cities. This, however, will come to pass only when human boasting ceases and awe and fear of God arise again in the very heart of political thought and feeling.

The Greek used the word πόλις as a Divine allegory. Christians have to regain its literal meaning as a human "burgh," "castle," "city," a preliminary safeguard against evil. Every human word is made towards the image of God's Word, in order to be a light for man's life. The life of the πόλις is meant to be lived towards its final consummation in God's eternal city, in a pilgrimage from political sin to political perfection.

George Stock.

CORRESPONDENCE

BAPTISM: THE PARENTAL QUESTION

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Mr Editor,

I have read with interest and a good deal of agreement your article on the "Disgrace of Baptism." I could not, however, help regretting the somewhat summary manner in which you dismissed the report of the Joint Committee of Canterbury Convocation as "meagre and miserable." The report is indeed short, and it does not suggest any very startling or original methods of dealing with the problems surrounding the administration of Holy Baptism. As one who had some part in the work of the Committee which drew it up I could not help wishing that you had specified more clearly the points on which it required amplification to remedy its meagreness, and the

points with which you definitely disagree, which are, no doubt, the ones which justify your epithet of miserable.

It is true that the report does not make any proposals as to how best to deal with the parental problem. That the Committee made no direct suggestions does not necessarily mean that it was ignored. Your own article does not come to any clear conclusion about it. My own opinion, for what it is worth, is that when you try to define what you mean by a " Christian home " or " Christian parents " you will find yourself faced with so many difficulties that, like the Committee, you will conclude that the most practical things to aim at are (*a*) to secure that the parents are told as plainly as possible what baptism implies and encouraged to do their best about it, and (*b*) to provide at least one godparent who is likely to exercise Christian influence upon the child's upbringing.

If this seems to be shirking the issue, I would ask, How do you define a Christian parent ? One who goes to Holy Communion three times a year ? One who has been confirmed ? One who has been baptized ? One whose name is on the electoral roll ? One who happens to appeal to the parson of the parish concerned ?

We know well enough the kind of parents whose children we receive for baptism without hesitation, but when we face up to the question of refusing the Sacrament, then we have to find some principle upon which to act. This requires definition, which is the difficulty. I hope contributors to THEOLOGY will enlighten us further.

Meanwhile, may I humbly suggest that the clergy would not be administering Holy Baptism in a less satisfactory way than is, alas, too often still the case in a good many parishes, if they would study and put into practice the proposals of the meagre and miserable report which both Houses of Convocation have been so misguided as to commend to their attention.

Yours sincerely,
RICHARD SOUTHWARK.

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
5, KENNINGTON PARK PLACE, S.E. 11.
July 23, 1940.

[WE described the Report of the Joint Committee of the Canterbury Convocation as " meagre and miserable " because, as the context of the remark shows, the Report entirely ignores the question of the spiritual fitness of the parents of children to be baptized. Many letters that we have received confirm us in thinking that this question is crucial. We are far from supposing that it admits of an easy answer. This, however, makes it all the more important that it should be carefully considered, and not merely passed over. The Convocation Report says that the clergy ought to make inquiry as to the

spiritual fitness of proposed godparents, and adds that communicant godparents should be "our ideal." If inquiries can be made as to the spiritual fitness of godparents, why not also as to the spiritual fitness of parents? If it is practicable to provide at least one godparent who is likely to exercise Christian influence upon the child's upbringing, why not also at least one parent? Is the Church of England to resign itself indefinitely to its present incapacity to determine, for practical purposes such as this, who are and who are not its members?

But, apart from its failure to deal with this question, the Report seems to us to compare very unfavourably with that recently presented to the Chapter of the Rural Deanery of Poplar (*Infant Baptism : History and Modern Practice*, Theology Occasional Papers, New Series, No. 1). If one rural deanery could produce the latter, surely something more substantial and striking might have been expected from the combined resources of the Canterbury Convocation.—*Ed.* THEOLOGY.]

THE CONFLICT IN ANGLICAN THEOLOGY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

May an interested reader of THEOLOGY, who yet has no claim to be a theologian, ask for further light? I turned with hope to Mr Bruce's article in your August issue, being in complete ignorance as to wherein the "conflict" lay. The article certainly throws light on the nature of the conflict, but I am still completely baffled as to the reason for the conflict. With regard to the two "contrary" questions as to the Church's existence on p. 83, may one not see and say that there is truth in both answers given? Does the "givenness" of the Church forbid one to speak of its function in the world?

Yours,
EDWARD S. G. WICKHAM.

August, 1940.

[Other correspondence is held over till next month.—*Ed.* THEOLOGY.]

SURVEYS

(A) SOME RECENT BOOKS ON THE OLD TESTAMENT

Of the books sent to me by the Editor of Theology for inclusion in this survey, the most important is *A Companion to the Bible* (T. and T. Clark, 12s. 6d.), edited by Dr T. W. Manson. Those who write on Old Testament subjects are Professor C. J. Mullo-Weir (Language), Professor H. H. Rowley (Introduction), Dr W. O. E. Oesterley (Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and Angelology and Demonology), Dr W. J. Phythian-Adams (Geography), Dr J. W. Jack (Archæology), Professor T. H. Robinson (History), Professor S. H. Hooke and Dr H. Wheeler Robinson (Religion), Dr W. F. Lofthouse (Ethics) and Professor N. H. Snaith (Priesthood and Temple). The editor's main contribution is concerned with the New Testament, but he is responsible too for the introductory chapter on the Nature and Authority of the Canonical Scriptures, and for some useful appendices on the Calendar, Chronology, and on Weights, Measures and Money. The volume is well indexed and there are six outline maps.

It is not only the excellence of the individual contributions that makes this a valuable book so far as the Old Testament is concerned. It has indeed a special value at the present time in that it clearly demonstrates the error of those modern "Marcionites"—and they are to be found even among the ranks of the clergy—who believe that the Old Testament no longer has any claims to be read or studied, that it has little or no relevance to the Christian revelation. Its form and contents have been determined by the conviction that "the primary and vital interest of the Bible is that it records the authentic word of God—His gracious revelation of Himself in terms of personality and life in the midst of the life of men" (p. v). Its main interest, therefore, is fixed on two matters—the content of the revelation and the historical context within which it is first given. "As a matter of historical fact," Dr Manson writes, "the revelation is given within the framework of the History of Israel" (*ibid.*). It is this fact that gives to Old Testament study in all its aspects its surest vindication. A thorough study of the Old Testament is an indispensable preliminary to the proper understanding of the New. Dr Manson and his distinguished colleagues have struck a powerful blow in the cause of sound Biblical study. They have done more. They have shown also why the Old Testament rightly continues to be read in Christian Churches

alongside the New—itself " a very Hebrew book " (p. 8). This is a heartening volume.

The Old Testament Shortened (Sheldon Press, 5s.; School Edition, 3s. 6d.), edited by Dr W. K. Lowther Clarke, has been well planned. The selected passages are arranged in accordance with the historical order of the twelve parts into which the book is divided, and they are accompanied by such notes, by way of introduction and comment, as are necessary for an intelligent reading of them. While generally following the Revised Version, the editor has not hesitated to translate from an emended Hebrew text or from the Septuagint, when the result is an improvement on the Revised Version. He lays a proper emphasis upon literary sources, especially in the earlier parts of the volume, and his inclusion of a few extracts from non-biblical sources, such as the Hymn of Ikhnaton and the Assuan Papyri, serves to illustrate what is a fundamental position in modern Old Testament study—namely, that the history, religion and literature of Israel can be properly understood only if they are studied, not in isolation, but within the framework of ancient Oriental antiquity. This book is intended primarily, it seems, for teachers. They will find here the critical position stated with a quiet caution. The numerous illustrations, in black and white and in colour, serve their purpose well.

The problems that arise out of a study of the Psalms are amongst the most baffling in the whole range of Old Testament study. The body of critical literature on these problems is already immense, and it continues to grow. As so frequently happens, the gulf between this expert study and " the man in the street "—in this case, the ordinary worshipper—yawns wide, and little attempt has yet been made to bridge it. To meet this need Dr C. C. Keet, whose *Liturgical Study of the Psalter*, published in 1928, is well known, has written a most useful little book, *The Psalms: A Brief Introduction* (Mowbrays, 2s.). It consists of three chapters, which deal with the composition and structure of the Psalter, the outlook of the psalmists, and the Psalms in public worship and in private devotion. Within its limits—it is less than a hundred pages in length—these subjects are ably and interestingly discussed.

Dr Oesterley's *Readings from the Apocrypha* (Sheldon Press, 3s. 6d.) has been prepared in the hope that it may be the means of bringing about in the schools a recognition of the value of the Apocrypha as the necessary link between the Old and the New Testaments. This it is well calculated to do. The selections illustrate much of the best which the books contain, and the short commentaries and explanatory notes that accompany them will be found helpful. The translation does not depart unnecessarily from the Revised Version, but it is at the same time an independent one. In the case of Ecclesiasticus, the Hebrew text—no part of which had been discovered when the

Revised Version was made—has been used. A new version of this book has been made also by A. D. Power—*Ecclesiasticus or the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sira* (Hodder and Stoughton, 3s. 6d.). Its object is "to enable the English reader to understand without hesitation what is believed the author had in his mind, and thus to render a commentary unnecessary." As far as possible the Authorized Version is adhered to, but passages have been adopted here and there from other versions, and emendations of more recent scholars have been called into service. Though it may be felt that the author has not always been happy in his choice of the version to be followed (for example, he prefers the Greek version in xxxviii, 21[a], where the Hebrew version gives a far more pointed meaning), yet he has produced an attractive volume which should make a popular appeal. Its very full subject index, covering thirty-four pages, is a noteworthy feature.

The subjects of the six lectures which Dr C. V. Pilcher publishes under the title *The Hereafter in Jewish and Christian Thought, with Special Reference to the Doctrine of Resurrection* (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) are—The Messiah; the Kingdom of God; Hades, Hell, Paradise, Judgment; Resurrection in Primitive Thought and in the Thought of Ethnic Religions; Resurrection in Jewish Thought and in the Thought of Our Lord; and Resurrection in Christian Thought. There is also an Appendix—The Hereafter in the Christian Thought of Medieval Iceland. The Jewish literature, other than the Old Testament, with which the author is concerned, is the Apocalyptic and the Rabbinic. While the former may be said to be familiar to Christian scholars, the latter is not so well known as it deserves to be. The material from this source which Dr Pilcher has collected should therefore prove of great interest to many. His research, he tells us, has led him to conclusions which are largely similar to those of the Commission on Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. To demonstrate this general agreement, or at least similarity of attitude, he has placed quotations from *Doctrine in the Church of England* at the head of each lecture.

The results of Professor Garstang's important excavations at Jericho have been made available to scholars in the *Annals* of the Institute of Archæology of the University of Liverpool. In *The Story of Jericho* (Hodder and Stoughton, 8s. 6d.) he presents them in more popular form. In simple outline the story is traced from the days of the earliest settlements in the Neolithic Age down to the Iron Age when, in the days of Ahab, "did Hiel the Bethelite rebuild Jericho" (1 Kings xvi, 34). There are some excellent illustrations as well as maps, chronological charts and a good index. The archæological evidence, Professor Garstang believes, points to a date some time between 1400 B.C. and 1385 B.C. for the destruction of Jericho by Joshua, and this date has already been accepted by some Old Testament

scholars. Not all expert opinion, however, is on Professor Garstang's side, for some eminent archæologists, for example Vincent and Albright, do not accept it. Clearly the last word has not yet been said (the reader is recommended to consult Professor Rowley's article "Israel's Sojourn in Egypt" in the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxii [1938], p. 243 *ff.*; this article appears in an abridged form under the title "The Eisodus and the Exodus" in the *Expository Times*, l [1939], p. 503 *ff.*). The walls of Jericho fell, in Professor Garstang's view, as the result of an earthquake. The fullest weight must be given to this view, coming as it does from the excavator himself. It may, however, be mentioned that Dr Jack has suggested the possibility that the walls may have been undermined (see *Expository Times*, xliii [1931], p. 91 *f.*; li [1940], p. 411, and Dr Manson's volume, referred to above, p. 178). The part played by seismic phenomena in the departure of the Israelites from Egypt in so far as they throw light on their entry into Canaan is the theme of the last chapter in the book, which is written by J. B. E. Garstang, the son of the excavator.

It is difficult to find any merit in the three books that remain to be dealt with. *En-Roeh: The Prophecies of Isaiah the Seer with Habakkuk and Nahum* (T. and T. Clark, 14s.), by the Rev. W. A. Wordsworth, is full of curious things. Thus the writer holds that Isaiah is the author, not only of the whole of the Book of Isaiah, but also of the Book of Job and at least half the Psalter; that Habakkuk and Nahum are his contemporaries; that the "virgin" of vii, 14 is to be identified with Lo-Ruhamah, the daughter of Hosea; and that the occasion of xxviii, 10 *ff.* was a banquet given, in celebration of the completion of the Siloam tunnel, by Shebna, the antichrist, the stuttering Ethiopian who "cannot speak Hebrew decently even when sober" (p. 213, n. 6). He has some strange things to say too about Immanuel and the symbolism of the waters of Siloam. His book gives the impression that he has found playing with the Hebrew text a pleasurable pastime. Often his suggested reconstruction of it can only be regarded as a travesty of the Hebrew language; and frequently, when it is translated into English, it makes nonsense. Ingenuity is here in plenty, but no discipline. The result is a fantastic book, which cannot be put into the hands of students, and which the scholar will not find it necessary to consult. Dom Hubert van Zeller's *Daniel: Man of Desires* (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 7s. 6d.) is an attempt to present a picture of Daniel's life and career in Babylon in the sixth century B.C. As a specimen of his style the following may be cited: "Chaldæan matrons would have been only too pleased to secure the presence of this eligible young man (and party) at whatever entertainments the Babylon season should happen to provide" (p. 43 *f.*). Comment seems unnecessary. In *The Jewish Character* (which bears no publisher's name and costs 2s. 6d.) the author, who writes under the pseudonym

Ivrith, endeavours " to represent the nation of the Holy Writ not only as Hebrew, but as representative of ancient Semitic thought and spirit as it has remained to us during all the changes of centuries." The result is a worthless hotch-potch. The English style in which it is written (the German origin of the author betrays itself throughout) makes the book almost unreadable. It abounds, moreover, in appalling inaccuracies and almost unbelievable misprints (" brason see," p. 28; " 112 tribes of Israel," p. 76; " St Augustus," p. 102, are typical examples).

Some hard things have been said in the preceding paragraph. It is, however, the present writer's conviction that the interests of Biblical study are not furthered if a bad book is declared to be anything other than bad.

D. Winton Thomas.

(B) CHINA

When I last sent a survey of theological movements in China a year ago, the theological college where I work was just on the point of moving from Canton to a distant village in " free China " in West Yunnan. At a farewell party in Canton I said that I felt we were moving to the Lost Horizon; I said I wondered if before long we should feel we were one of the last strongholds of civilization in the midst of a raging, warring world, beneath and around our distant hills. To-day, as the war continues in China, and as we hear night by night on our wireless of German armies invading nation after nation, I feel that those words have been all too tragically fulfilled. Meanwhile, in our costly isolation, the rest of China seems almost as remote as does England and Europe. If my friends from other parts of China should read this survey, and should feel that I have misinterpreted what people are doing or thinking elsewhere, they must forgive me and pity my remote retreat in these distant Yunnan mountains.

As our college has moved to a refugee situation in the West, we have, however, seen what many other people have seen in the interior of China. Everywhere in these last years the interior has been opened up to new political and economic life; and this has in turn also affected the religious life and work. There is quite an acute issue for the work of the Church in this opening-up of the interior. So far the work in the West has been mainly in the hands of the Roman Catholics, or of fundamentalists, evangelical missions and sects. To-day there is a far higher intellectual level in the West, as Universities have moved to the interior, and as Chinese of high educational standard have moved for government or business work. It is an acute question, whether the non-Christians of this higher intellectual standard will be converted, and whether the Christians who have moved will find their spiritual home, in such Christian work as has so

far existed in the West. Recently I have heard several Chinese Christians of high standing say that they could find no spiritual home in the district where they now work. Issues and tensions between liberal and authoritarian Christianity, long since thought through elsewhere, are still alive through this westward migration. There is an urgent issue for Church policy, as the more liberal Churches follow their membership and open up work in new areas in the interior.

In another way the opening up of the interior raises very important questions for theological work. Many of us are discovering a new China, or rather we should say discovering the old China, which we had not seen elsewhere. In Canton we saw everywhere the fruits of modern industrialization, and we scarcely saw at all any living tradition of the ancient religion and life and customs of China. A prominent Chinese Christian leader, with whom I discussed the materials for these notes, described it as "the fallacy of the big cities" to suppose that this ancient China did not exist. Certainly here in West Yunnan it has been intensely interesting to see the survival of ancient religious customs that have long since died out round Canton. During the last year I have myself attended ancient Confucian and Taoist ceremonies; and I have been shown manuscripts of Taoist rites, six or seven centuries old, preserved by the Taoist priests in this village. In the village people, as indeed in village communities in most countries, there is a deep and real, if simple and occasionally also superstitious, piety. The relationship of Christianity to the other world religions has been raised in every country, through Dr Kraemer's book and the Madras Conference. China has perhaps the leading protagonist for a sympathetic and positive approach, in the work which Dr Reichelt has done for seeing in Buddhism a schoolmaster to bring the Chinese to Christ. Certainly in this village I should feel that the everlasting God, revealed in fulness in Christ, does not look scornfully on the century-long religious customs, with which the village people of China have been feeling their way to the One Lord of all Truth.

As the Madras Conference raised, here as elsewhere, the question of the relationship of Christianity to other religions, so also it carried to a further stage the question of the co-operation and ultimate reunion of the Christian Churches. Here in China many of us have found a new knowledge and a new sympathy with other Churches, as we have been faced with the immense needs caused by the war, and as we have co-operated in service to meet those needs, and have found in action the fact of our service of a single Lord. Largely as a result of the Madras Conference, the National Christian Council has been planning regional conferences, in order that the leaders of the different Churches might plan co-operatively together for the development of Christian work in the newly opened areas of the West. There

is immense need for further reunion work. The evangelism of all our Churches is frustrated, so long as no one of us can say with full conviction that in coming to Christ men must come into the fellowship of our one particular Church. The disunion of the Churches is complicated by the tendency for missions to cultivate an inward loyalty toward themselves, and so virtually to become a new denomination. Recently I came across an indigenous Chinese mission, which ought to have been founding branches of the main Churches; instead of this it has practically become a new sect of its own, and I was told that it had its own training school where it rebaptized all its workers ! There are then also the indigenous revival sects, such as the Little Flock, though I am told that they have for some reason been less active since the war in China. Meanwhile the confusion of competing Church loyalties leads the ordinary Chinese Christian to say, I will have none of your Western institutions. There is indeed a danger that a kind of reunion will come in this way, if the leaders of the older Churches cling in conservatism to their own small loyalties, and fail to lead the Church forward into organic reunion. The laity of the younger Churches may simply take the lead into their own hands, and refuse the complexity of competing institutions, and cast away their attachment to any institutional Church life. A vague sense of Christian fellowship will then take the place of the disciplined institutional life of the Church. Christianity will evaporate into vagueness, and we shall lose altogether that institutional life which has been the traditional fellowship of the Church.

I have nearly reached the limits of a survey; and as yet I have said practically nothing of real movements in theology. The reason is that in China there is, alas! little or nothing to say. There is very little real scholarly study of Christian history and origins. There is a little, but all too little, study of the synthesis of Christian tradition with the best traditions of Chinese culture. There is little if any publication of original theological writing. It is probably fairly common for educated Chinese to resent any implication that Christianity is a foreign religion, belonging to Western nations and brought by them into China. It is far less common for them to recognize that Christianity was Eastern before it was Western, and for them even to begin to make that same integration between Christian and Chinese thinking that was made in the West between the Hebrew and Greek traditions. This relative poverty of theological work can be traced to several causes. One main cause is the practical and ethical tradition of Chinese culture, which has led the Chinese to welcome first the more ethical sides of the Christian tradition. Another main cause has been the predominance of American influence on mission work. And since most missionaries leave their own country when they are young, and are then cut off from full contact with the movements of thought in their own country,

mission work lags twenty to thirty years at least behind the life of the Church elsewhere; and the American influence is the social gospel type of Christianity, as yet untouched by the deeper theological tones of Barth or Niebuhr. A third and more recent reason is the imperative practical needs created by the war, and the inevitable impatience in time of war with slow and patient scholarship or speculative thinking. For these reasons the dominant themes in Christian thinking and writing in China are all practical. The centre of interest lies in religious education. Christ and the home, the co-operative movement, the village Church, or similar themes. Such integration as there has been with Chinese culture is mainly practical, rather than philosophic or theological. In the excellent collection of hymns which all the Churches are coming to use, we have a small but useful number of Chinese tunes. As Italy or Holland had their Italian or Dutch madonnas, so there are the first beginnings of some very successful experiments, in the painting of Gospel scenes in traditional Chinese artistic forms. We must comment, these ought ye to have done, and not left the other undone. Christianity will never be established as an indigenous religion in China, nor will it ever win the potential intellectual leadership of the country, until there is both far more first-hand Chinese research into Christian origins, and a far more thorough synthesis of these with all that comes close to Christ in Chinese philosophic tradition. There is urgent need for a very great raising of the standard of theological work; and though some of us have written and discussed hopefully of future plans, it will be difficult to do very much in the way of reconstruction so long as the war lasts.

Meanwhile there remain with us the urgent issues raised by the war. There are still the urgent claims of relief work. There are still the urgent issues raised by the Japanese occupation of vast areas of China. We still debate, how far should our loyalty to our own nation, and our right protest against the injustice of aggression, make us refuse to co-operate in any kind of way in building up the life of an area under enemy rule. We still ask how far should our loyalty to a God, who is Lover of the poor who are stranded in these areas, yes, and Lover too of the Japanese armies that have invaded them, make us launch out in Christian leadership and service in these areas, regardless of the political tensions, which our action will cause both in our own and in other hearts. For myself, I have spent most of this year regretting that I accepted a decision, with which I did not at the time myself agree, to withdraw our college from an occupied area. And to-day I ask again, as I asked a year ago, whether these precise issues will not become far more acute, as indeed they have already during the last year begun to become more acute, in the West as in the East. We must in these days serve first a God of Justice; we must see that His Justice is over

all nations; and many of us felt first in China, and then felt later for the West, that we must be willing to let the military force of our nation be used as an instrument of justice. We must allow our nation to be used for Christ; and so long as it is thus used, we must be loyal in our citizenship to our own nation. We must, however, in the West as in the East, guard a little carefully, and question our hearts a little carefully, lest when it comes to the point of crisis, it should prove that our nation is the stronger loyalty. We must beware lest in fact we should be found saying, we serve Christ for the sake of our nation, but we serve Him, only so long as such service may prove of advantage for the life and the strength of our own particular nation.

G. F. Allen.

Canton Union Theological College,
Tali Hsi Chow,
Yunnan.

May 24, 1940.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE LIFE OF PERCY DEARMER. By his wife, Nan Dearmer. With an Introduction by the Very Rev. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St Paul's. Cape. 10s. 6d.

It was during his time as Vicar of St Mary's, Primrose Hill, N.W., from 1901 to 1915, that Percy Dearmer (1867-1934) made his mark upon the Church of England. Given (as this biography somewhat naively expresses it) " a church of his own," he was able to demonstrate, exhibit, advertise *urbi et orbi* the *Parson's Handbook* (published in the spring of 1899, and already in its second edition before the year was out), the *English Hymnal* (1906), the Warham Guild, whitewash, plainsong, carols, the use of silence in congregational prayer, and the Children's Catechism (with some acknowledgements to St Sulpice). To-day there is hardly a cathedral or a parish church in this island that has not been influenced, directly or indirectly, by Dearmer's enterprise at Primrose Hill; nor is his influence limited to his own communion. But he also rendered a particular service to the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church of England. It is true that his own Anglo-Catholicism was skin-deep, for he believed rather in the holiness of beauty than in the beauty of holiness, and his interest in dogmatic orthodoxy or in the deeper significance of ceremonial was never very strong. It is true also that his antiquarian fervour was not always sufficiently controlled by common sense. Yet the historic importance of the *Parson's Handbook* is comparable with that of the " Tracts for the Times," to which it was indeed complementary, for the Tractarians had been characteristically uninterested in ceremonial, and chaos and indiscipline, accentuated by an uncritical deference to Italian fashions, itself provocative of equally wilful and uninformed No Popery riots, had been the bitter fruit of that indifference. *The Parson's Handbook*, supported by the heavy artillery of the Alcuin Club, pointed the way out from " the prevalent mess, which is due to a blend of private judgment and Popery, and can't be defended on principle " (p. 126), and not only paved the way for *Liturgy and Society* (1935), but has also contributed to clarify the issue in the Anglo-Catholic party between, on the one hand, the great majority who are essentially Anglican in their loyalties, and the Holy Father's Fifth Column on the other.

Having achieved all this, Dearmer suddenly threw up his benefice and became a rolling stone. For the next sixteen years he wandered through desolate places seeking recognition and awaiting ecclesiastical preferment. It seems that he had be-

come restless and disheartened and disgruntled: he felt that his work was not sufficiently appreciated, that his influence was diminishing, that he really ought to be a Dean. To his friend Lord Beauchamp he wrote in 1911: "I am getting tired out with the difficulties of Primrose Hill. People imagine that I am inseparably connected with it because I have tried to make the people here do the right thing. But you don't know what it has been like—nearly all the parish is now boarding-houses and maisonettes and there are hardly any children left to teach. I can't go on much longer! . . . What we manage to do, we do *in spite* of things. . . . I am sure I ought to move. This is my eleventh year, and after ten years, in a tiny sphere, one knows one is only marking time, and really wasting one's life. And then when one is about 70, and all one's best working time over, they put people into Deaneries, as a sort of old age pension! If one could only have the chance of putting life into some cathedral, while one is still comparatively young!" It was not that he was an ecclesiastical careerist, but rather that, with all his vivid intellectual and artistic gifts, he lacked perhaps something that is indispensable to the priestly character—namely, reverence, with all that it implies of patience and humility and dedication. It is all too easy to complain in his case, as in others, that "the outside world was more ready than the Church to honour his gifts" (p. 271); but the Church has responsibilities which the world has not, and is bound to look in the first instance for other qualities in her ministers than such as may very properly be rewarded with an Honorary A.R.I.B.A. or a Professorship of Ecclesiastical Art at King's College, London. Nor is it without significance that in two of the portraits reproduced, taken in 1928 and 1935 respectively, Dearmer is shown wearing a lay collar and an almost aggressively lay suit. "The unattached years, eight of which were spent in Chelsea, were a trial for Percy; he could not but feel that his gifts were unappreciated. . . . None the less, . . . I doubt, for instance, if his influence on the young of all ages would have been so great, if he himself had not been forced for a time to stand aside and see the Church, at any rate partially, from a layman's point of view" (p. 268). Alternatively, it might have been even greater. The real question is whether, in this context, the word "lay" means "lay," or whether it means "secular"—or "anti-clerical"?

However, the peculiar character and constitution of our National Church permit of an unusual and, within bounds, a salutary indulgence to the rogue elephants in her ministry: witness Basil Wilberforce, Dick Sheppard, Ernest William Barnes, Charles Raven, Hewlett Johnson. (I suppose that the tradition began, modestly enough, with Dean Stanley; perhaps it is a pity that its beneficiaries have all been so very much of the same sort of colour. Certainly it is arguable that the business has been a little overdone in the past twenty years, and that

there is even something to be said for, as well as against, a refusal to compound with Progress, Liberalism, and Modern Culture.) Thus, when the Labour Party came into office for the second time, Dearmer's sympathizers signed a manifesto, addressed to Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, and, thanks to their insistence, a Westminster Canonry was soon forthcoming. It should be recalled that Dearmer had picked up Liberal-Socialism during his Oxford undergraduate days; he joined the Fabian Society in 1890, and was the first secretary of the Christian Social Union, a post which he held from 1890 to 1911. A. J. Penty, in his last—and best—book, *Tradition and Modernism in Politics* (1937), distinguished and contrasted the two strains in Socialism or Socialist Communism: " one is idealistic, cultured, humanitarian, generous and woolly; the other cares for none of these things, is clear cut, direct, materialist, thirsting only for revenge. And the latter, owing to the prestige of the Russian Revolution, has conquered and destroyed the other." Dr Dearmer—he had procured a B.D. and D.D. from Oxford University in 1911—belonged emphatically to the older school. The nucleus and residuum of his piety was in fact a romantic humanitarianism, a nebulous belief in " fellowship," which, at the last, rejected the Christian Sacraments as inadequately sacramental (and apparently confused the Eucharist with the Agape). In his preface to *Christianity and the Crisis* (1933) he wrote: " By Christianity we mean, I think, in this book a very large thing, larger perhaps than any of us can yet know. We mean—I at least do ultimately mean—the religion of all good men. . . ." As a Canon of Westminster, he delivered sermons in the Abbey on Federal Union (three times), Capital Punishment, and Birth Control; while in 1932 he gave " a course of Lenten lectures on ' The Splendour of the Church of England,' characteristically preferring this heartening topic to the more usual Lenten one of Sin " (p. 297).

The essence of liberalism is an intolerance of orthodoxy, and little need be said of *Songs of Praise* (1925) except that it is inspired by the same liberal outlook. It was launched at Liverpool Cathedral, and was intended to provide " a national collection of hymns for use in public worship, and also of such ' spiritual songs ' as are akin to hymns and suitable for certain kinds of services in church, as well as for schools, lecture meetings, and other public gatherings. *Songs of Praise* is intended to be national, in the sense of including a full expression of that faith which is common to the English-speaking peoples to-day. . . ." Significantly, in hymn 131 (" There is a green hill far away ") the verse " He died that we might be forgiven " is starred as one that " may be omitted without doing violence to the sense." Among the Advent hymns is one (69) which begins:

> With Jesus for hero, for teacher and friend,
> The world to the Purpose of God shall ascend.

The *English Hymnal* had been criticized on the ground that it introduced the invocation of saints into public worship; *Songs of Praise* introduced the invocation of coneys (305, " The mouse, the coney hear our prayer "). As a supplement to an Anglican hymn-book, such as *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, it may have its uses; from the musical point of view, many of the tunes are good, although every parish priest knows that his people prefer to sing the old favourites to the familiar tunes; but as the staple of congregational worship in any parish church *Songs of Praise* is wholly inadmissible, and it may well be wished that Dearmer's hope that it " may prove not unacceptable to those who bear the responsibility of our national education " had not been so generously answered. The basic assumption that twentieth-century religious sentimentality (orientated " to meet the new spiritual and intellectual needs which are so widely felt to-day ") is not only intrinsically superior to Victorian religious sentimentality, but also constitutes an ultimate standard which posterity is unlikely to do more than refine, has yet to be substantiated; it partakes of the weakness inherent in the Liberal conception of Progress, which always seems to resolve itself into looking down into a deep well and seeing your own face, magnified, at the bottom of it; while the truculent boast (in the Preface to the Enlarged Edition) that " In the future, intelligent men will be able to take up a hymn-book and read it with as much interest and appreciation *as any other collection of poetry or music* " goes to suggest that Dearmer had been out of parish work so long that he had come to forget what is the function of a hymn-book. But the fundamental and insuperable objection to *Songs of Praise* has nowhere been better stated than by Fr A. G. Hebert, S.S.M., in *Liturgy and Society* (p. 225): " Hitherto, the hymn-books which have been put into the hands of the people have always been orthodox in intention; but this book presages a corruption and degradation of our liturgical tradition, which is the more serious because the words which the people say or sing make a deeper impression than those which they hear from the pulpit." These are hard words, but they are amply substantiated by the critical footnote on p. 226 of the same work; and attention may also be recalled to a brief but memorable review by Dr Lowther Clarke in THEOLOGY, vol. XXIV, May, 1932, pp. 291-2. However, *Songs of Praise* seems to be perfectly adapted to the requirements of the syncretistic cultus of the B.B.C.

Such was the tragedy of Percy Dearmer. Could it have been averted ? " I think we may say," writes Dr Matthews in his Introduction, " that no other church in Christendom could have produced a man like Dearmer or, having produced him, could have kept him in her fold. . . . But we must not flatter ourselves too much. We held him, but did we make the best use of him ? I scarcely think so." The real question is what

should have been done with him when he came to the end of his time at Primrose Hill, and it does not admit of any simple answer. One thing is certain: the life of Percy Dearmer, the Dearmer of *The Parson's Handbook* and the Dearmer of *Songs of Praise*, the young Dearmer with his generous passion for social justice, and the old Dearmer with his aggrieved and acrimonious resentment against "Clericalism and Credalism," illustrates an interesting and perhaps a significant chapter in the history of the Church of England; and it is as a contribution to that history that this biography should be welcomed.

CHARLES SMYTH.

THE OXFORD BOOK OF CHRISTIAN VERSE. Edited by Lord David Cecil. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

There can be little doubt that the Oxford Books of Poetry are one of the means by which the culture of the past filters through into the mind of the present—at least into that green and mellow mind of Middle England that wants to be told what it should read with the same decisive authority and the same robust disregard for eccentricity as it is advised what to eat and drink and (in the good old days) how to tie a cravatte. The trouble is, of course, that poetry will not really fit into these accepted patterns or positions—at least not without grave loss; but, if the weakness be admitted and a certain amount of squeezing and pushing forgiven, *The Oxford Book of Christian Verse* may be acknowledged a real achievement.

It is an achievement that has cost its editor considerable misgiving. Lord David Cecil briefly says: "A large proportion of religious poetry is poor stuff. The average hymn is a byword for forced feeble sentiment, flat conventional expression. And those poets who have invoked both the sacred and the profane must have, with some striking exceptions, found themselves more comfortable with the profane." He might have added that even in religion, the fire, the storm and the earthquake have left little room for the still small voice that can alone claim to be experiences recollected in tranquillity. Perhaps that is why some of the most authentic pieces in this unusually satisfying anthology appear from the most surprising corners of history. Chaucer, Southwell, Donne, Blake, Browning and Eliot we expect to get: but it is Raleigh, Pope and Bridges who here supply some of the most moving or enlightening moments in religious poetry. Even an anonymous muse of the seventeenth century can cry with charming poignancy:

> Say bold but blessed thief
> That in a trice
> Slipped into paradise,
> And in plain day
> Stol'st heaven away,

What trick could'st thou invent
To compass thy intent ?
What arms ?
What charms ?

Love and belief
. . . . . .
I sight to God His pain;
And by that sight
I saw the light;
Thus did my grief
Beget relief.
And take this rule from me,
Pity thou him, he'll pity thee.
Use this,
Ne'er miss,
Heaven may be stol'n again.

This is a tender fruit of Christian emotion—as crystal clear as anything that a Bunyan or a Herbert ever produced; but there are richer harvests to be gathered—a wider dispensation in the Christian tradition that must be met by any anthologist who would do justice to the Christian mind in all its aspects. There are even stoic virtues—fortitude, temperance and moral independence to be vindicated; and Lord David Cecil is not afraid to admit the poetry of ages " whose rising tide of individualism made impossible any universally accepted tradition of religious verse." In such a constellation Milton shines out like a sun who obscures the lesser lights; and that is why an anthology such as this should be dipped into rather than read as a whole—approached from the isolation of one's own mind rather than viewed in the context of poetic history.

There is, however, a genuine growth of religious poetry—reflecting and registering a growth of religious consciousness in England; and thus it is that we at the end (as Lord David Cecil at the beginning) cannot refrain from divisions that are not artificial. The poetry of the Middle Ages, of the Renaissance, the counter-Reformations and Puritan Revolution is no mere myth but solid realities with which we have built up a tradition that is by no means completed yet. There are gaps in the tradition here—odd little corners that the anthologist has occasionally filled with straw, instead of with bricks made from the straw of human frailty; and it may fairly be asked why Chaucer is so sparsely represented and (to leap the centuries) Miss Evelyn Underhill not at all. There is, however, milk for babes and strong meat for men—while those who demand that this, like other Oxford Books of Verse, should give a bird's-eye view of England's pastureland of poetry will gain the spectacle in miniature which their hearts desire.

ASHLEY SAMPSON.

THOUGHTS IN WAR-TIME. By William Temple, Archbishop of York. Macmillan. 4s. 6d.

LEVIATHAN AND THE PEOPLE. By R. M. MacIver. Oxford University Press. 8s. 6d.

FEDERAL UNION: A SYMPOSIUM. Edited by M. Chaning-Pearce. Jonathan Cape. 10s. 6d.

THE BACKGROUND AND ISSUES OF THE WAR. By H. A. L. Fisher, A. D. Lindsay, Gilbert Murray, R. C. K. Ensor, Harold Nicholson, J. L. Brierley. Clarendon Press. 6s.

Here are four books dealing with questions which, since the outbreak of war, have dominated the minds of the inhabitants of the British Isles. It is a frequent occurrence to-day to hear questions asked by people who have long since despaired of receiving any satisfactory reply—questions such as " What should be the Christian's attitude toward war ?"; " Why does God permit war ?"; " What does democracy mean ?"; " Is democracy worth preserving ?" Accordingly we should be very grateful to those who have examined and discussed these problems. Each of the authors of these books and essays is an expert in his own study or profession, and therefore his views cannot but be of great interest and value, even to those who may not always agree with them.

The series of addresses given by the Archbishop of York during the first few months of the war will prove to be the greatest help to Anglicans and others who, in these times of turmoil, are looking for guidance and leadership. In the first part into which these addresses are divided the Archbishop deals with three burning questions. Has war been sent by God as a divine judgment ? Should a Christian take the life of another man in warfare ? Should a Christian pray for victory ? The Archbishop's answer to the first question is the assertion of the reconciliation of the omnipotence of God with the freedom of will of the individual. In reply to the second, he makes the provocative statement that human life is not sacrosanct. If this is accepted, the whole foundation of the pacifist's position is shattered. In reply to the third query, we are told that a Christian may in all conscience pray for the Allies' victory, if in so doing he is not praying merely for victory as such but for the accomplishment of God's will. In the second part the Archbishop deals with the spirit and aims of Britain during the war; and the third portion is a survey of theology to-day, which originally appeared in this journal.

Even more so than in the 1914-1918 struggle, this war means " fighting for democracy," and it is agreed that, with the victory or defeat of the Allies, democracy stands or falls. It is therefore most necessary that we should have a clear idea of what democracy is and for what it stands. This is what R. M. MacIver gives us in *Leviathan and the People*. In this book he

describes dictatorship, that monster of tyranny which all men thought had been decapitated in the French Revolution, but which reappeared as powerful as ever after the last great war. With this form of government, born of times of political crisis, Mr MacIver contrasts democracy, the result of centuries of natural growth. The author is an impassioned champion of democracy and he may perhaps be excused if he refuses to give the dictatorships credit for any good works.

The phrase "federal union" has been constantly used in recent times. To some it is a dangerous suggestion; to others a panacea; to others again a Utopian dream. In this series of essays, federal union is discussed from every conceivable aspect. Its history is traced from the Greek cities to the foundation of the great modern federal states; theologian, psychologist, author, scientist and socialist, among others, plead for the cause. The arguments, many of which come from enthusiasts, are preponderantly in favour of federalism. It is inevitable, therefore, that the benefits of federalism are stressed, while the difficulties are minimized. Whether or not the reader agrees with federalism, he will find in *Federal Union* a book of more than ordinary interest.

The Background and Issues of the War is a series of lectures delivered at Oxford last Michaelmas Term. "The Historical Background," by the late H. A. L. Fisher, traces German hopes, fears, aims, and aggressions from Versailles to Warsaw. Dr A. D. Lindsay's essay, with its provocative title, "War to End War," discusses the prospects of a lasting peace when the conflict is over. Perhaps the most interesting essay in the volume is the defence of the League of Nations by Dr Gilbert Murray, who for twenty years was either chairman or vice-chairman of the official committees of the League. The career of Adolf Hitler is graphically sketched by Mr R. C. K. Ensor. In "The Diplomatic Background," the Hon. Harold Nicholson discusses Hitler's foreign policy, showing that it is merely the continuation of the old doctrine of pan-Germanism, which had been fed on Treitschke. These essays enable one to obtain a much clearer understanding of the international situation, and they are written in a style which makes their reading easy and attractive.

In addition to these four books, there are two booklets which will be of interest to Roman Catholics: *The Catholic and the War*, by Hilaire Belloc, and *The Justice of the Present War Examined*, by Elizabeth Anscombe and Norman Dell. These two pamphlets exhibit that highly developed, though sometimes distorted, system of reasoning which distinguishes Roman Catholic literature. Mr Belloc is, as ever, emphatic and entertaining. It is hard to believe that he himself takes his arguments as seriously as he expects his readers to do.

H. F. R. Morris.

Trinity College,
Dublin.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: L. Levonian, *Islam and Christianity* (6s.); R. W. Wilde, *Vision Work Service* (3s. 6d.); W. Ellis, *The Idea of the Soul* (12s. 6d.); H. B. Parkes, *Marxism : A Post-Mortem* (7s. 6d.).

BLACKWELL: A. Sampson (Ed.), *This War and Christian Ethics* (6s.); A. Elliott Peaston, *The Prayer Book Reform Movement in the Eighteenth Century* (7s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: A. H. Armstrong, *The Architecture of the Intelligible Universe in the Philosophy of Plotinus* (7s. 6d.); S. H. Thompson, *The Writings of Robert Grossteste* (21s.); H. M. Barrett, *Boethius* (7s. 6d.); P. Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Catechism* (7s. 6d.); D. Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England, 943-1216* (45s.); R. H. Thouless, *Conventionalization and Assimilation in Religious Movements* (2s. 6d.).

CHRISTOPHERS (University of Pennsylvania Press): I. S. Ryberg, *An Archæological Record of Rome, Seventh to Second Centuries B.C.* (2 vols., 35s.).

C.L.A.: Archbishop of York, *Prayer for Victory* (1d.); *Behold how Good and Joyful* (6d.).

CLARENDON PRESS: C. N. Cochrane, *Christianity and Classical Culture* (30s.).

CONSTABLE: George Santayana, *The Realm of Spirit* (16s.).

DACRE PRESS: D. M. Mackinnon, *The Church of God*, Signposts No. 7 (1s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: R. S. Frayn, *Revelation and the Unconscious* (10s. 6d.); V. Taylor, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching* (8s. 6d.); T. B. Shepherd, *Methodism and the Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (10s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: C. Rankin (Ed.), *The Pope Speaks* (7s. 6d.).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS: W. E. Rappard, *The Quest for Peace* (22s. 6d.).

S. HOBHOUSE (FAILAND, ST CATHARINE'S, BROXBOURNE): L. Tolstoy, *Assarhaddon, King of Assyria : Life is One in All* (1d., or 50 for 2s. 6d.)—reprinted from *The Adelphi*.

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: E. J. Paul, *Romanism and Evangelical Christianity* (16s.).

MACMILLAN: F. C. Grant, *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (7s. 6d.).

MARSHALL, MORGAN AND SCOTT: W. W. Lucas, *War and the Purposes of God* (5s.).

MOWBRAYS: K. Mackenzie, *The Meaning of Churchmanship* (6s.); R. L. Barnes, *The Priest and his Priesthood* (2s. 6d.).

NELSON: *Qualben's History of the Christian Church* (12s. 6d.).

NICHOLSON AND WATSON: A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors* (4s. 6d.); A. T. Cadoux, *The Theology of Jesus* (9s. 6d.).

SANDS: *God who giveth Joy* (1s. 6d.); A. Hellen, *Jeanne Jugan (Sister Mary of the Cross)* (1s. 6d.).

SHELDON PRESS: J. R. Coates, *War : What does the Bible say?* (1s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: G. L. Prestige, *Fathers and Heretics* (12s. 6d.); H. Caiger, *Sunday Afternoon* (5s.); J. F. Mozley, *John Foxe and his Book* (12s. 6d.); R. J. Parker, *How they found Christ : Stories of Indian Christians* (3s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher